

PROTECTION OF ALASKAN FISHERIES

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is about to move an adjournment until Monday. We will have a morning hour, of course, if that is done. I want to state that I should like to take up at some time during the morning hour—I think probably it can be done without very much discussion, probably by unanimous consent—House bill 8143, for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes. It is a very important measure indeed. The salmon season is coming on very rapidly, and I hope I shall be able to have the bill passed on Monday at some time.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very important bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 24), 1924

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY

To be major

Second Lieut. Ambrose Irving Moriarty, retired, to be a major on the retired list of the Regular Army, to rank from April 28, 1924, with retired pay as prescribed by law for a major of his length of service retired prior to July 1, 1922.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Roger Cushing Rowse, of Missouri, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, by promotion from deck officer, vice R. W. Byrns.

Frederick Gurnee Outcalt, of New Jersey, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice W. O. Manchester.

Edwin Jay Brown, of Michigan, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice J. A. Bond.

Henry Arnold Karo, of Nebraska, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice J. D. Crichton, promoted.

Jack Chester Sammons, of Kentucky, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice J. W. Cox, resigned.

George Livingston Anderson, of Virginia, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice Benjamin Friedenberg, promoted.

Isidor Rittenburg, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, by promotion from aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, vice L. O. Stewart.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 24), 1924

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS OF THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

CLASS 1

John Campbell White.

CLASS 3

Raymond E. Cox.

Thomas L. Daniels.

Percy A. Blair.

Lawrence Dennis.

POSTMASTERS

PENNSYLVANIA

James I. Steel, Shamokin.

Ray J. Crowthers, West Elizabeth.

WEST VIRGINIA

Alphonse Leuthardt, Grafton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, May 3, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, in whose presence our souls take delight and find calm and joy and peace, give us the faith that casts out fear and fortifies the heart. With all eagerness for truth and wisdom, may we approach our duties and bear our responsibilities. Let come into our lives a more charitable, vigorous, and richer religion, flowering into sweeter sentiments and ripening a larger harvest of human brotherhood and cooperation. Bless the Speaker and all Members and officers of this Congress. As men chosen for a great service, help us to stand for truth and right. Always bless us with the assurance that we have as our allies time and eternity, the universe, and God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CAPE COD CANAL

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report from the Committee on Rules for the consideration of H. R. 3933, entitled "A bill to provide for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) making appropriations for contingent expenses of the United States Senate, fiscal year 1924, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the amendments of the House to the bill of the Senate (S. 2902) entitled "An act authorizing the acquiring of Indian lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho for reservoir purposes in connection with the Minidoka irrigation project."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution making appropriations for contingent expenses of the United States Senate, fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents another privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report from the Committee on Rules for the consideration of H. R. 8209, a bill entitled "To create the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the transportation act, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave to revise and extend the remarks which I made on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks he made on yesterday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BARKLEY-HOWELL BILL

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Barkley bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Barkley bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House of Representatives, during the past two weeks my mail

has consisted mainly of protests from railroad employees and business men against the passage by Congress of H. R. 7358, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky. Hundreds of such letters have been received by me, the total reaching almost the same number of epistles received in favor of the plan of tax reduction advocated by Secretary of the Treasury Mellon. But one letter in favor of the passage of the Barkley bill was included in the large volume that poured into my office.

To show the wide interest that the Barkley-Howell bill is creating throughout our great country, I wish to quote the following communication, which is a fair sample of the manner in which this proposed legislation is viewed throughout the land:

DEAR SIR: Attention is respectfully drawn to a bill known as S. 2646, and the Howell-Barkley bill before Congress at the present time, which if enacted into law will deprive a great number of men working in the employ of railroads all over the United States, and particularly on western railroads, of their inalienable right to representation on any board or body presuming to function for them.

It has been pictured to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce that the whole country, excepting the railroad management, is supporting the bill. This is anything but the truth, and the obvious purpose of the statement is to befuddle the minds of those not fully informed in the matter so that the measure might be enacted into law for the benefit of the proponents of the act to the exclusion of others to the number of possibly 700,000.

The bill proposes adjustment boards which are made up of an equal number of men, respectively, from the managements of railroads and from the nationally organized crafts. In this connection I would beg to draw your attention to the fact that there are, as far as the crafts mentioned in boards No. 2 and No. 3 are concerned, a greater number of men that are not members of the nationally organized crafts than those that are.

The plan as laid out proposes to place a cost against our Government to the extent of \$356,000 for salaries alone, and with the added expense that is made permissible the first cost can easily be increased to a million dollars a year. The fact is that the framers of the bill have appreciated the cost and have made provision in section 8 for drawing on any unappropriated funds in the Treasury to the extent of \$500,000 up to the 1st of July, 1924. And this expense to be saddled upon us and the rest of the public without either of us having one iota of representation. This is "taxation without representation" with a vengeance and makes one wonder if it is going to be necessary to reenact the scenes of the Boston tea party.

Inclosed you will find a little paper published by our independent organization, which carries on page 4, under the caption "Presentation by your delegates," our statement made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce April 7, 1924.

We most respectfully ask that you give said article such consideration as you can, so as to learn our views on the matter, the better to determine whether the proposed bill does not smack of class legislation.

Naturally these hundreds of letters aroused my interest and led me to make a more careful study of this legislation than might have been the case under other circumstances, especially in view of the fact that the Committee on Interstate Commerce had been relieved of any consideration of the measure by reason of the presentation of a petition to the House of Representatives signed by 154 Members, thus precipitating the matter into this body before any of the Members had had time to digest its provisions or gain any idea of its importance. Such methods of legislation bear a close relation to mob rule and should be condemned by everyone who has the interest of the people and his country at heart. The committee of this House of which I have the honor to be a member sat for 42 days to hear the proponents and opponents of an important measure before that body for consideration, and at the end of that lengthy hearing the proposed legislation was rejected by a decisive vote, and, although I was favorably inclined toward the bill and voted to report it to the House, I also had the satisfaction of knowing that the proponents of the legislation had had their day in court and had no cause for complaint.

But in this case there has been no hearing given either side, and all the information that the Members of the House have on the subject is what they have been able to obtain themselves or gleaned from the propaganda sent them by either labor leaders or the representatives of the railroads.

To my mind that is certainly a most crude manner in which to attempt to enact important legislation that is bound to affect many millions of people and cause bitter controversy in place of the peace and contentment now existing under the provisions of the present transportation act. The railroads are just getting upon their feet, and their employees are prosperous and happy. Why, then, should we start another industrial war

that possibly would upset all business and lead to endless strife and trouble before we have given a fair trial to the present transportation act? To me it seems the height of folly to countenance such legislation at this time, and the only explanation I can find for this attempt to unstabilize business is the fact that we are on the eve of a presidential election, and such occasions are always seized upon as the opportune moment to force through measures supposed to be in the interest of labor. But the word that I have received from the business men and the people of my district is that they are opposed to the Barkley bill and the methods employed to attempt its forced passage by Congress, and therefore my vote will be recorded against it.

The Barkley bill, from my reading of it, provides for four boards of adjustment, two of 14 members each and two of 6 members each, appointed by the President, half from nominations made by nationally organized crafts and half from nominations made by carriers. This creates 40 annual salaries of \$7,000 each, amounting to \$280,000; and four secretaries, at \$4,000 each, \$16,000 more; besides salaries of employees to be employed by the boards at rates they fix—see page 12. Also, a board of mediation and conciliation of five members, at \$12,000 per annum each, a total of \$60,000; besides the pay of attorneys, assistants, special experts, clerks, and other employees provided for in paragraph 3, page 15, and arbitration boards, further provided for in section 7, the estimated annual expense being about \$1,000,000. In these days, when the people are demanding a reduction in taxation and the abolition of the many useless boards and bureaus that now encumber our Government, it would seem to me that we should go rather slow in considering such legislation and adding that expense to an already overburdened public.

One of the objections to the bill is that the 16 nationally organized crafts absolutely control the appointment of one-half of the adjustment boards, while a majority of the railroads' employees are not affiliated with the nationally organized crafts, but are local independent unions, and their members will be at the mercy of the nationally organized crafts.

I am not opposed to union labor. In fact, I am in favor of it unless they go too far and make demands that are unreasonable and unjust, and that is what I claim they do in this instance. I have employed union labor for over 30 years, and have never had a dispute with my employees during that time. In that period their wages have risen from \$12 a week to \$60, and my firm has paid them several million dollars.

On page 5 of the Barkley bill, section 2, the reference to general duty is taken from title 3 of the transportation act, which act made it the duty of carriers, officers, and so forth, to exert every reasonable effort and adopt every available means to avoid any interruption to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between carrier and employee. The Barkley bill makes it the duty of the carrier, officers, and so forth, to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions and to settle all disputes arising out of the application of said agreements in order to avoid any interruption to the operation, and so forth. But paragraph 8, page 34, relieves the employees in case of adverse decision by the arbitrators, because there is nothing to prevent them from quitting their jobs. That seems to be one of the jokes in the Barkley bill, and if the employees do not like the decision of the arbitrators the public can walk, as far as they are concerned. The report is prevalent that the bill has been designed to bring about Government control or ownership, or at least make the nationally organized unions the dictators to the railroads and the public, and you will find that a great majority of the American people are opposed to any such program. They want labor to secure fair treatment and a square deal, but they are not willing to abdicate railroad control into the power of any one class. Personally, it seems to me the bill is un-American, unfair, and not as good for the public as the legislation it seeks to replace.

There should be a clear explanation of the alleged defects in title 3 of the transportation act of 1920 and the act of July 15, 1913, providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, so as to justify the repealing of those acts and substituting the provisions of the Barkley bill, with its questioned procedure and enormous expense, and that explanation should be before a committee where everyone in favor of or opposed to the pending bill could be fully heard—the public who are vitally interested, the employees not represented by nationally organized labor unions, the carriers, and the nationally organized labor unions themselves. So much labor and care were expended on the act of 1920 that it seems to me almost criminal to repeal it and substitute something else without an opportunity for interested persons to be fully heard.

SOLDIERS' ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the adjusted compensation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the adjusted compensation bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly five and a half years since the close of the European war, when a great victory was won by the valor and the fighting qualities of the American soldier boys. Lest we forget—who is there who can forget? Who is there among the membership of this House who served during the war Congress who can forget those fearful days when by our votes more than 4,000,000 of our young men were separated from homes and loved ones, from jobs and opportunities in life, to fight the battles of our country? And they fought. They fought like heroes. They turned the tide of battle and carried the American flag to a glorious triumph, the fame whereof will live with an increasing luster as long as history continues to be written.

Lest we forget—who is there among us who can forget? During the war days, and since, our work here in Congress has constantly brought home to our knowledge the great sacrifices made by our brave soldier boys; the great sacrifices, the distress and suffering endured by the dependents at home. We have come to know something of the economical and physical handicaps from which these boys and their families have suffered. Time has not lessened our knowledge. It has, rather, increased it with each new distressing case claiming our attention and arousing our sympathies.

We know something of the vast numbers of young men who, due to their Army experiences, have suffered and are still suffering not only from economical handicaps but from physical ills as well. We have been told in one of those phrases coined by the propagandists that everything should be done for the sick and disabled but nothing for the "able-bodied young men better off because of their Army experiences." "Able-bodied young huskies," wrote one correspondent from home, influenced, no doubt unconsciously, by one of the many expressions to which a certain portion of the press has given currency. But we who served in Congress during the war and since have come, with the lapse of time, more and more to know, as distressing incidents have piled upon distressing incidents, how utterly false is that propaganda which seeks to divide the veterans into only two classes—those who are injured to a compensable degree where relief can be obtained from the Veterans' Bureau and those who are able-bodied and better off because of the war experiences.

We know there are large numbers with impaired health, with physical suffering from war experiences, not of a nature permitting compensation through the Veterans' Bureau. No statute can describe with that degree of accuracy essential to proper administration by administrative officers those ills of the many who physically are not as well off as prior to their terrible war experiences. We know when we see and converse with them and ineffectually fight their cases before the Veterans' Bureau that they have lost ground physically, and one's sympathies and sense of fair play can not but be aroused. Mothers, wives, and children, dependents of these soldier boys, have suffered and are suffering, and it is with some thought of these dependents that the adjusted compensation bill has provided a 20-year endowment policy in lieu of cash, the same as did the adjusted compensation bill that passed the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed a bill with the purpose that it shall be enacted into law. The recognition, much too long deferred, justly due the veterans is at last in some measure to be accorded them. In its essential feature the bill is the same as passed the last Congress—a 20-year endowment policy in lieu of cash. When the boys returned home in 1919, out of employment, with their meager Army pay discontinued, and dependents unprovided for, then was the time their compensation should have been adjusted and paid in cash. The failure to do so was a grievous wrong and has entailed much suffering, as we all know.

In 1922 we met the objection of the President that without new and additional taxes no money was in the Treasury with which to pay the compensation. It was then that the plan of a 20-year endowment policy was first adopted, embodied in the bill that passed the last Congress. But by 1922 there was another and an appealing reason for the endowment policy plan instead of cash. The veterans had mostly secured some measure of employment, although it was a struggle to make ends meet with the high cost of living and with the accumu-

lated debts for family support accumulated while the boys were at the front or before they secured employment after arrival home. Every thrift argument in favor of life-insurance 20-year policies was equally applicable to these Government endowment policies. The accrued value is made payable to the veterans at the end of 20 years, or in event of death to his beneficiaries. Here is something to take home to wife or mother. Here is something to make the veteran and his family feel that some recognition has at last been given to those whose services and great sacrifices won the war.

The speech I made in the last Congress in favor of the adjusted compensation bill is equally applicable to-day. When letters from opponents of the bill have mirrored the misrepresentations of the press, I have fervently wished that there could have been opportunity to discuss with these correspondents the various features of the proposed legislation. I realized then, and with the renewed attacks from certain of the press during this Congress I have continued to realize, that unfortunately the active business man has little opportunity for independent investigation and is therefore of necessity dependent upon the ex parte statements of the papers he reads.

The gross misrepresentations of the press opposing this legislation have exceeded in mendacity any previous instance within my experience and observation. Recently, in evident anticipation that the bill would become a law, when the truth would be brought home to the people, these papers abandoned their "five-billion raid" cry and indulged in a new falsehood to the effect that the endowment policy plan is a change from the bill in the last Congress, which it is not. There is no cash option in the present bill. There was no cash option in the bill that passed the last Congress.

In that portion of the press opposing this legislation it has been repeatedly suggested that Members of this House are being subjected to threats, coercion, and undue pressure upon the part of those who favor this legislation. I have received letters from good, sincere friends at home, misled by this false propaganda, urging me not to surrender to "the threats of bonus propagandists." Mr. Speaker, upon my solemn oath, up to the present moment I have yet to receive the slightest hint of a threat from those who favor this legislation. I have received from them appeals and arguments upon the merits but not the slightest semblance of attempted pressure or threats. This statement was made by me in the last Congress. It was true then. It is true to-day. All the threats, all the questioning of motives, have come exclusively from opponents of the bill.

It is true that I have received threats. It is true that I have been subjected to attempted coercion. A considerable number of communications have attempted to influence my vote on this measure, with threats of loss of votes for me on election day. But, Mr. Speaker, communications of this nature have been limited exclusively to those who have written in opposition to any adjustment of compensation for the boys who were taken away from opportunities in life and sent to the battle front at \$1 and \$1.25 per day. From those who have sympathized with these boys, with their lost opportunities, with the lack of employment they have suffered, with the uncertainties of their future, with their impaired health, has come no word of threat, not even a word of protest. Only kindly appeals have come from them. The intolerant demands, coupled with threats, have come from their nonsympathizers.

For the great majority of those who have thus threatened, no one should have other than a kindly thought. It is evident that they have been misled, carried away, by the false notion that the alleged "bludgeon" was being used by the proponents and therefore should be offset. How little they have realized that they themselves were misled into being exclusively guilty. I received an apology from one who, unprompted, has taken a second thought and has been willing to believe the truth that the legislators here in Washington have been conscientiously endeavoring to arrive at a just conclusion uninfluenced by threats or attempted coercion from any source.

To those who have attempted to influence my vote against this adjusted compensation bill, not by argument but by threats of reprisal, let me suggest that ever present before me in my home there has stood for years, in a frame, those inspiring words of the immortal Lincoln:

I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have.

Mr. Speaker, in the war Congress I voted for the declaration of war, and I voted for the selective service law that took these boys from their jobs, from their opportunities in life, and sent them to the battle front. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the burden of responsibility felt by all in this House at that time.

There was no lack of understanding. We fully realized what it all meant.

We could foresee the great loss of American lives, and if life was spared, the sacrifices required of our young men who would return home disabled not only in health and limb but also in lost opportunities in life's struggle. We could foresee all this. And we could foresee the great burden of indebtedness under which this country must struggle for many years to come. It was no easy task. The thought of the boys who would be torn from their homes brought tears to the eyes of many of us as we voted for war. Those were days burdened with heavy responsibilities, from which there was no escape. I for one am glad to be in this Congress to vote for some measure of recognition and recompense to the disabled boys; to those disabled physically to a compensable degree under the Veterans' Bureau law something additional to what they are now receiving, and something to those disabled in lost positions and lost opportunities in life, and to the many disabled physically but unable to secure compensation through the Veterans' Bureau under the present law or under any law that ingenuity could possibly devise to describe the innumerable cases of weakened constitutions and lost energy.

One good neighbor wrote me in opposition to the proposed legislation. He wrote feelingly of the loss of my only son in the war. In his reference to adjusted compensation legislation, I take the liberty of quoting from his letter:

No one could give more than you gave to the war—your only son. And I am quite sure that if he was living to-day he would feel that money offered to him for the service he did could only place those services on the same plane and the same basis as other things that can be bought with money.

To this suggestion I could only reply that—

I appreciate deeply what you say in regard to my son. You are quite right. I am sure that if my son were living to-day he would not accept the bonus if offered. He would not need it. I am also quite sure that if he were here his lack of need for himself would not prevent him sympathizing with the many who have returned from the war in need and disabled through the loss of position and opportunity. That thought is one of the elements which I feel bound to consider in my efforts to reach a right conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, this reference to my personal bereavement took my mind back to 1917 and to a thought in my mind when in the spring of that year my son graduated at Yale in the class of 1917. I recall how rejoiced I then felt that my boy had finished his college course before the war came to take him away. It was then, Mr. Speaker, my thoughts first turned to the boys who had not been so fortunate, who had to be taken from college before graduation. Most of them, unless greatly blessed in this world's goods, would be too long away to make it possible ever to retrieve the lost ground. Those of the class of 1917 were fortunate. But how about those of the later classes in the colleges of the land, except the wealthy few who could afford to return to college, where time did not count so much in their lives? I speak of those not so well off. No hope for them.

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the young men who were then just starting in a business of their own with thrifty savings all invested in the venture? The selective service law for which we voted permitted no exemption because of loss of business. The business had to be sacrificed in each case when the young man was taken. His accumulation, with his life's ambition, was destroyed overnight to meet the exigencies of war.

And how about the boys taken from jobs that meant more than the then job? In the great corporations where many were employed the job meant a life's opportunity. How about them when they returned to find the places filled by those who had not gone to the war? Is there nothing to be said for these when it is proposed to readjust to some small extent the pittance of a compensation accorded to them under the exigencies of war by our votes when they were taken away?

Accorded to them by our votes! I recall, Mr. Speaker, the debate on the selective service law when the \$1 per day was agreed upon. We named \$1 per day, and then later \$1.25 for overseas duty. We dared not name more because we did not know how long the war would last. If we had then named \$2 per day and \$2.50 per day for overseas duty, no voice would have been raised in protest, and it would have been little enough. No one would have called it "placing a dollar mark on patriotism." Patriotism impels the young man to do, but patriotism requires of us who could not go that some just consideration be accorded to those who suffered the sacrifice.

Let me quote from one of the speeches of that day—April 28, 1917—when we adopted what legislation termed the "selective service" law and the newspapers designated "conscription":

Back of it all I want to see this Government, great and rich and resourceful as it is, furnish the means to pay the men who go to the front to fight its battles for it at least as much money as men can earn at home who are left out of danger to continue in the vocations that will furnish them prosperity not only for the present but after the war is over, when the soldier boys are out of their jobs.

This sentiment met with applause, but the soldier boys were voted only \$1 per day. Now we propose to readjust this compensation with \$1 per day additional and \$1.25 per day additional for overseas service. There is no element of gift, no element of gratuity, in performing this act of justice.

I for one can not understand how any Member of this House who then voted to conscript these boys, at \$1 per day, under the exigencies of war, can now fail to readjust the compensation on the basis of \$1 per day additional. These boys by their valor shortened the war. If the armistice had been delayed one month, the additional cost to our Government would have been far greater than the total involved in this readjusted compensation. Every other country associated with us in the war has since the close of the war granted additional compensation to the returned soldiers. Is this country of ours, the richest country of them all, to be the only country to refuse readjustment of a pitiable small pay to the soldiers who have sacrificed so much to gain the victory for our flag?

And what will be the total cost of this readjusted compensation? One New York paper, which I have read daily since my maturity and shall continue from habit to read notwithstanding its continued despicable misrepresentations, has repeatedly reiterated the falsehood that it would cost \$5,000,000,000, intending to mislead its readers with the thought that on a cash basis paid now there could be no reduction of taxes. The fact is that the provisions of this bill bear no relation whatever to the administration tax-reduction plan. It has not interfered with the tax-reduction plans one dollar nor postponed them one day. In the place of a present cash payment the bill offers a 20-year paid-up endowment insurance policy. The total cost will amount to not more than \$2,000,000,000. The utmost possible maximum will not be more than \$2,025,889,696, a difference of \$3,000,000,000 between truth and newspaper falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, the more I have studied the provisions of this bill the more willing I have been to give it my support. The substitution of paid-up insurance policies in lieu of cash will tend to encourage thrift and will provide immediate cash payment for the full amount of the policy to the loved ones in case of death. It presents a splendid solution of a difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, the adjusted compensation has now become the law of the land. The tax reduction bill has now been enacted into law. The country will now know that we can have both. We have both. In the adjusted compensation bill recognition has been given to the valor and to the sacrifices of the defenders of the Republic without interference with the purpose to reduce taxes. The new revenue law reduces taxes more than \$400,000,000. Before its enactment the assertion was made that a deficiency would be created. The Treasury Department now admits that there will be no deficiency. A table by the Actuary of the Treasury shows a surplus under the new tax reduction law for the fiscal year 1925 of \$138,900,000, exclusive of taxes to be collected for previous years. The estimated surplus for the fiscal year 1925 is more than \$400,000,000. Contemplate these figures, Mr. Speaker. The people relieved of tax burden more than \$400,000,000, and also we will have a surplus in the fiscal year 1925 of \$400,000,000, promising a still further reduction of taxes at an early date.

Through the cordial cooperation of the Republicans in Congress with the President in effectuating Government economies this result has been achieved. It only needs the reelection of our Republican President with a Republican Congress to give him support in order to carry on the good work to a triumphant conclusion. Those of us who loyally supported the administration plans for tax reduction have had an uphill fight in this Congress, where in both the Senate and in the House the administration Republicans were in a minority. We have not obtained all for which we fought, but we have a better tax reduction bill than would have been possible if the fight had not been made. Although in the one matter of adjusted compensation for the veterans of the war, the President accorded with the views of Secretary Mellon and not with the views of the large majority of the Republicans in Congress, it is absurd to pretend that we have not given the President a cordial and willing support. The President has no misgivings on this score. The public will soon come to learn the truth. They will not remain deceived, the

misleading, exaggerated statements in the press notwithstanding.

The President has no misgivings on this score. He does not share the views of that portion of the press which, while claiming to give him support, are preaching the strange doctrine that a President of this Republic should dictate the vote of the people's representatives on every measure that comes before Congress. Here is what President Coolidge has said about Congress:

The independence of the Congress must be preserved. It is not the fortune of legislatures to be popular; they do not catch the public fancy. Being human, they may err. But no legislature ever usurped the liberties of a country, and no country ever lost its liberties until its legislative representatives had been stripped of their independence and their power. The sole defender of the liberties of the nation by the only effective means for their preservation, an independent Congress, now left to the American people is the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition to the adjusted compensation bill will never cease to be beyond my comprehension. It has been said that republics are ungrateful. I do not believe it. We by our votes in favor of some recognition to our brave soldiers have been unwilling to admit it. Why, Mr. Speaker, have the valiant soldiers been singled out as the sole object of attack? When the civil employees of the Government were given \$240 bonus per annum to meet the increasing cost of living, no protest was made. This bonus was granted in 1918 to all civil employees receiving basic salaries up to \$2,500 per annum. The increased cost of living justified the increase. The need for the increase was universally recognized for the civilian employees who had dependents to support. But the boys at the front also had dependents at home suffering from the increasing cost of living. Why the discrimination? The sacrifices were great. The sufferings were terrible. Why give a bonus to a civilian employee receiving \$2,500 per annum and deny it to the soldier who far away from his dependents faces death for the Republic at \$365 per annum? Will any of the opponents of the adjusted compensation bill answer this question? Treasury figures disclose that \$300,000,000 have already been expended to meet this readjusted compensation for the civilian employees and their additional compensation under new legislation is to continue permanently, merged in their basic salaries. The soldier boys received only \$30 per month. From this \$30 was deducted \$15 for compulsory family allowance. A further deduction was made to pay Government insurance premiums. From the balance of the paltry sum these soldiers were urged to purchase Liberty bonds. They did so willingly in large numbers, and living necessities compelled them later to sell their bonds far below the par they paid to the Government from their meager wages. Business corporations are required by law to pay the insurance premiums to insure their employees in hazardous employments. Fighting at the battle front is the most hazardous of all employments, and yet this great, prosperous Government compelled our soldier boys to pay for their own insurance, and those who are keeping up their insurance premiums are now furnishing the money to support the dependents of those who lost their lives in the war. They, with their premiums, and not the Government, are in great measure paying to the widows and orphans of our dead the insurance that has been substituted for pensions. It is incredible that any American citizen should be opposed to some measure of readjustment for these boys.

The Government did not tell these boys when they were called to the colors that their pay of \$30 per month would be taken away from them to do the work that the Government should do—care for the dependents of dead soldiers. Deduct compulsory allotment, insurance premiums, fines for every infraction of regulations and loss of equipment, and subscription to Liberty bonds—how much was left? Where was money to come from to meet the increasing cost of living for the dependents at home?

Mr. Speaker, the intolerant attack in the press against these valiant soldiers has been disgraceful, selfishly disgraceful, beyond measure. In 1917 these boys were called "flower of our youth"; in 1918, "our brave soldier boys"; in 1919, "our heroes"; in 1920, "the returned soldiers"; in 1921, "ex-service men"; and now we hear them called by a mercenary press "Treasury raiders." To some of us, Mr. Speaker, they still are and shall ever remain the brave soldier boys who suffered much and sacrificed much, and whose dependents suffered much, for the country we love.

The Republican platform of 1920, upon which President Harding was elected and President Coolidge was elected Vice President, pledged to the people that we would discharge to the fullest the obligation of a grateful Nation to these veterans of

the war. Not only must republics not be ungrateful. The platform announced that "Republicans are not ungrateful. Throughout their history they have shown their gratitude toward the Nation's defenders." Two paragraphs of the platform made pledges for the physically disabled and another paragraph pledged ourselves to discharge the obligations of the Nation in appreciation of its defenders' services. I quote this paragraph as follows:

We hold in imperishable remembrance the valor and the patriotism of the soldiers and sailors of America who fought in the Great War for human liberty, and we pledge ourselves to discharge to the fullest the obligations which a grateful Nation justly should fulfill in appreciation of the services rendered by its defenders on sea and on land.

Mr. Speaker, there was no mistake in President Harding's recognition and interpretation of this pledge. During the campaign in his speeches he advocated adjusted compensation for the soldiers. Misled by the statement from the Treasury Department to the effect that we were confronting a large deficiency, he suggested that Congress provide some new taxation to meet the payments. In his veto of the adjusted compensation bill which passed the last Congress without imposing new taxes, he said:

The latest Budget figures for the current fiscal year show an estimated deficit of more than \$850,000,000 and a further deficit for the year succeeding.

We now know the extent the President was misled by the Treasury estimates. Instead of a deficit of \$850,000,000 we have a surplus of \$400,000,000 after payment of \$200,000,000 in reduction of public debt. In other words, the Treasury Department when giving out figures to prejudice the adjusted compensation bill erred to the extent of the modest sum of \$1,250,000,000. And, Mr. Speaker, we have sufficient to meet all adjusted compensation payments for several years from the balance of this year's surplus alone, after remitting to the taxpayers 25 per cent of this year's taxes in accordance with the suggestion first proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker, my convictions on the subject of adjusted compensation were given birth during the war when my vote helped to send the boys to the front and when I came to know from contact with many distressing cases the irreparable injury suffered by them and by their dependents at home. I believe that with few exceptions those who have written me in opposition would themselves be possessed by convictions as deep as mine had they had the same opportunity to be in touch with these distressing cases. The problem has been solved in favor of the soldiers, and I shall always feel that it was a privilege to be a Member of this House to lend my voice and vote in grateful recognition of the heroes of the Republic.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Corning	Hoch	Mead
Anderson	Croll	Howard, Okla.	Michaelson
Anthony	Cummings	Hull, Tenn.	Miller, Ill.
Bacharach	Curry	Johnson, Tex.	Mills
Bankhead	Davey	Kahn	Mooney
Beck	Dickstein	Kelly	Moore, Ill.
Bell	Dominick	Kiess	Morris
Berger	Doyle	Kindred	Morris
Black, Tex.	Drane	Knutson	Mudd
Black, N. Y.	Drewry	Kurtz	Murphy
Bloom	Eagan	Kvale	Nelson, Wis.
Bowling	Edmonds	Langley	Nolan
Boylan	Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	O'Brien
Britten	Favrot	Lilly	O'Connell, N. Y.
Browne, N. J.	Fish	Lindsay	O'Connor, La.
Browne, Wis.	Freeman	Lineberger	Park, Ga.
Burton	Funk	Linthicum	Peavey
Cable	Gallivan	Little	Perlman
Campbell	Geran	Logan	Phillips
Carew	Glatfelter	Lucie	Quayle
Casey	Goldsbrough	McClintic	Ransley
Celler	Greene, Mass.	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.
Clague	Griffin	McKenzie	Reid, Ill.
Clark, Fla.	Hammer	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Robinson, Iowa
Cole, Ohio	Hardy	McNulty	Rogers, N. H.
Connolly, Pa.	Harrison	Magee, Pa.	Romjue

Rosenbloom	Stengle	Tydings	Weller
Schneider	Strong, Pa.	Upshaw	Welsh
Scott	Sullivan	Vaile	Wert
Sears, Nebr.	Sweet	Vare	Winter
Sears, Fla.	Tague	Vestal	Wood
Sites	Taylor, Colo.	Voigt	Wurzbach
Snyder	Taylor, Tenn.	Ward, N. C.	Wyant
Sproul, Ill.	Tinkham	Ward, N. Y.	Zihlman
Sproul, Kans.	Treadway	Wason	
Stalker	Tucker	Wefald	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were reopened.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. By special order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] is entitled to address the House for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has yielded in order that I may propound a request. I request that at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Michigan I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. We have an appropriation bill on the floor of the House which has been here for four or five days and it has been kicked about from one place to another and nobody knows when we are going to get to the consideration of it. It ought to be passed, and I do not believe we ought to let everybody in under these unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentleman from Kentucky having some time, and believe he should have it, but in view of the fact that the gentleman has had something more than an hour and the gentleman from Michigan is having 20 minutes, would the gentleman from Kentucky object to modifying his request and asking for 20 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Ten minutes does not look like much difference, but here is the situation: In my hour I spoke generally on the subject of the history of legislation of the kind we are discussing, and I did not devote more than 10 minutes to the bill which is to come up Monday. A number of speeches have been made during my unavoidable absence this week, and I think I ought to have at least 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Kentucky had one hour on this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not on this bill. I had an hour on the general subject, but I did not devote more than 10 minutes to the specific purposes of this bill, and in view of that I would like to have 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not seem to me we ought to be forever shunted from the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. But let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we are nearly through with appropriation bills.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall not object to this request, but if anyone else makes a request for further time, I shall object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I just want to call attention to the fact that this is Saturday and the Appropriations Committee must not expect to work us into the night on the District bill in consequence of the time that is now being taken with these speeches. The gentleman from Kentucky has already had more than an hour, but I am not going to object to his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE RESOLUTION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Michigan begins, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request. A resolution has just come from the Senate asking \$100,000 for the contingent fund of the Senate in order to pay expenses over there. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the Senate resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BARKLEY RAILROAD LABOR BILL

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the first thing Monday morning the Members of the House will be required to vote upon the motion to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from consideration of the so-called Barkley railroad labor bill (H. R. 7358) before holding hearings upon

it or giving it any consideration. I do not intend to discuss the merits of the legislation at this time, but shall confine myself to the question of procedure.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I wrote two of my constituents under date of March 26, 1924, that I should be glad to see the Barkley bill—

considered by the committee at the earliest practicable moment, giving due regard to the general legislative situation and the rights of other legislation pending before the committee.

For my part I intended then, and I intend now, to make good that statement, and if the bill is not taken from the committee to vote for hearings upon it and other bills proposing amendments to certain other sections of the transportation act at the earliest practicable moment after the committee completes consideration of the truth in fabric and misbranding bills upon which it is now working.

No fair or reasonable opportunity has been given the committee to consider the Barkley bill. The committee has been busily working practically every day since the bill was introduced. It has never refused to consider the bill. It did decline on a close vote to put it ahead of the truth in fabric and misbranding bills, which were introduced early in the session, and are urged by farm organizations and others. Certain members of the committee felt that they had committed themselves to vote for hearings on those bills before the Barkley bill was ever heard of.

I am one of those who believe that the transportation act of 1920, including Title III, the railroad labor provisions, should be amended. It was humanly impossible to write a law as comprehensive as it is and make it perfect. Time and experience were bound to bring out imperfections in it and to show the necessity for its amendment. But that is not the question raised by the motion to discharge the committee. The question now is whether amendments to the law are to be considered and made by Congress—in fact, as well as nominally—or are they to be dictated by the representatives of a particular group and forced through Congress without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" and without giving its Members time to understand what they are voting upon. Is Congress going to abdicate its function as a deliberative legislative body?

One of the principal criticisms of the present law has been that no adequate consideration was given to the labor provisions in it. This in spite of the fact that the committees in Congress worked upon it intensively for upward of a year, if not more, as was fully stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] yesterday. The House committee alone held hearings on the legislation almost daily from June 15 to October 4, 1919, and the bill was pending before the committee and before Congress from that time on until it was finally approved February 28, 1920. During all that time one of the principal topics considered and discussed in connection with it by the Congress and by the public as well was the proposals for the settlement of labor questions and disputes.

Listen to the testimony on this point of the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Mr. Robertson, before the Senate committee on the Senate bill similar to the Barkley bill (p. 2 of the hearings):

The failure of the transportation act, Title III—

He said—

is summarized as follows:

1. Its enactment was the result of hasty compromise.

It is evident that the representatives of the brotherhoods, while they may subject themselves to the charge of being "hasty" in this proceeding, do not intend to have it said of them that they were guilty of accepting any "compromise."

Mr. Robertson at the same hearing quotes with approval this statement, among others, of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, who, speaking of the Railroad Labor Board, said (p. 8, Senate hearings):

Whatever change is made in the machinery to solve these relationships the changes should if possible be constructively developed by the railway employees and executives themselves, plus, perhaps the assistance of independent persons who represent the public interest.

At another point in the hearings—page 9—Mr. Robertson testified:

Mr. Henry Bruère, vice president Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., for years in charge of industrial, etc., investigations, and research; Federal director United States Employment Service for New York State;

Director National Railways of Mexico, etc., at national transportation conference, Washington, D. C., January, 1924, as reported in 76 Railway Age, 237 (240):

"Henry Bruere * * * proposed that the railroad managers and their employees hold a conference to establish some plan of cooperation."

Mr. Robertson told the Senate committee, to use his own words, that—

before presenting their ideas to Members of Congress the railway labor organizations "labored" for 18 months in committees and conferences to develop their program. During the last nine months—

He continued—

they consulted with their attorneys.

He further stated that the bill as finally presented was re-drafted by the representatives of these organizations "no less than six times" before it was satisfactory to them and that it not only repeals Title III of the transportation act but "establishes a new and independent machinery." (Page 15, Senate hearings.)

The counsel for the organized railway employees, Mr. Donald R. Richberg, in his statement (p. 21, Senate hearings) said:

It should not be claimed that the bill is perfect. * * * Under congressional consideration it may well be improved—

But, as he modestly stated it—

we desire to express the hope that it may not be substantially altered.

And yet the representatives of these organizations, without consulting any except their own interests, after having worked in secret with the aid of experts for 18 months before they got a bill satisfactory to themselves, presented it to Congress on the 28th day of February and immediately demanded that the committee stop the consideration of all other legislation pending before it and pass their bill at once before Congress or the country had a chance even to study it to find out what it contained.

It can not be said that there has been any public demand to take the bill from the committee because the public has not had time to study it and become familiar with its provisions. When a bill is taken away from a legislative committee it ought to be done in the public interest and not at the behest of the private and selfish interests of any particular class. [Applause.]

After years of observation and study Vice President Marshall announced this as a part of his creed:

I believe—

He said—

that every inequality which exists in the social and economic condition of the American people is traceable to the successful demands of interested classes for class legislation, and I believe, therefore, that practical equality can be obtained under our form of government by remedial legislation in the interest of the American people and not in the interest of any body thereof, large or small.

As far as we are permitted to know, no agency of the Government anywhere has recommended or approved the Barkley bill. No one having the responsibility which comes with public office had anything to do with the preparation of it, not even the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who introduced it, according to his own statement.

The situation which confronts the House is the result of no accident. It has been deliberately planned. No one who heard the speech of the gentleman from Alabama Mr. [HUDDLESTON] yesterday will question the truth of that statement. The proponents of this legislation are familiar with legislative procedure. They know that ordinarily legislation of this importance must be introduced at the very beginning of a session of Congress in order to stand any chance of being considered and passed before adjournment. In spite of this and in spite of the fact that they had been working upon it for 18 months they waited for three months after Congress convened before bringing it to light.

I am not a mind reader, but judging from the procedure adopted in its preparation, the time of its introduction in Congress, and from the statements that have been made by the proponents of the legislation since it was introduced, one is forced to the conclusion that they never intended, if they could help it, to let Congress or the country have time to study it.

The more they reveal their plans and purposes the more it looks as though they intended from the beginning to pretend that the committee would not give them a hearing, and now they hasten to take the bill away from the committee before it has a reasonable opportunity to do so for fear it will.

The whole proceeding smacks of politics. Eliminate the politics, partisanship, and selfishness from it and there would be very little left. It is known that the national representatives of the brotherhoods are personally and politically opposed to the present Republican administration, and it has been suggested that their hope is by this maneuver to get the members of these great brotherhoods throughout the country to follow them in the coming election and vote against the Republican ticket. Incidentally, the same observation might be made about the lobbyists for certain other organizations that infest Washington. In fact, it has got almost to the point where an independent Member of Congress, even though he may agree with their views on a particular subject, resents their presence and propaganda and their apparent assumption that he can not do his duty or form a conclusion upon questions of legislation without their assistance. [Applause.]

Lobbyists may have their proper function; Congress certainly has its, and it is not the proper function of Congress to abdicate its legislative duty to lobbyists of any kind or nature.

The railway brotherhoods are strongly organized. It is said that their organization is the most compact and effective one extant in this country to-day. No sooner had the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to take their bill away from the committee been filed than their representatives went through the House Office Building in companies of two urging the Members of this body to walk up to the Clerk's desk and sign the motion to discharge the committee on the dotted line and afterwards to vote for it. It is said that they have been assured that a majority of the Members will do their bidding and that they are confident of success. If so, there is no need of anyone being deceived over the situation. I do not complain, but I refuse to be a party to any such procedure and I think every one ought to know what it is.

Their bill may be the best piece of proposed legislation ever drafted by the pen of man, but the Members of Congress have not been given an opportunity to form any intelligent judgment of their own as to whether it is or not. The bill is one of the most important that could be introduced in any Congress. If enacted into law, it will affect not only the employees of the railroads directly involved, numbering something over two millions, and the railroads, but indirectly the welfare of all the American people and their industries. Without extensive hearings no Member of Congress can form any intelligent judgment on what its practical effect will be if enacted into law. It takes no lesson from existing law. It does not attempt to perfect that but repeals it altogether and goes much further. In the language of the representative of the brotherhoods it "establishes a new and independent machinery" after hearing only one side of the case. It may well be that some time in the future interests adverse to those who drafted this bill will come along and want to tear it up by its roots and establish a system of their choosing. Is this the way to make progress? Is this the conception that the representatives of the brotherhoods have of the recommendation of Secretary Hoover that amendments to the railroad labor provisions of the transportation act should be—

constructively developed by the railway employees and executives themselves, plus, perhaps, the assistance of independent persons who represent the public interest?

The language of the bill embraces within its scope not only the carriers now embraced in the transportation act but it includes—

interurban and suburban electric railways operating as independent units—

As well as—

as a part of the general railroad system of transportation. * * * and any receiver or any other individual or body, judicial or otherwise, when in the possession of the business of employers or carriers—

And the term "employees" is made to cover—

all persons in the employ of bureaus, associations, committees, and institutions of whatsoever kind or character maintained or supported by or existing in furtherance of the interest of carriers.

The language evidently includes suburban and interurban electric railways whether engaged in interstate commerce or not, even though they operate entirely within the territorial limits of a single State. Since when has Congress jurisdiction over carriers engaged solely in intrastate commerce?

What does the language "any receiver or any other individual or body, judicial or otherwise," mean? Does it mean that the courts are to be stripped of the power which they now

have? Is Congress going to pass upon such legislation without knowing what it is?

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] said on this floor yesterday:

The issue is plain.

I agree. The issue is not whether the legislation is meritorious or not but whether Congress is going to be given sufficient length of time to study it to ascertain for itself whether it is or not. In fact, the issue is whether Congress is going to abdicate its function as a legislative body in favor of the lobbyists for the railway brotherhoods and allied organizations whenever their interests are involved under the threat of political destruction. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman mind yielding?

Mr. MAPES. I prefer not to yield. I have only two or three minutes remaining, and I am sorry I can not yield.

They made the issue. We did not. It is of their choosing, not ours. They threw out the challenge. Are we to run away from it?

It will not hurt the committee to take the bill away from it. In fact, it will relieve it of a great responsibility and much hard work. It will hurt the cause of labor. It will be a bigger setback to labor than it has received in a generation. No fair-minded friend of labor will approve of the strong-arm method of forcing it through Congress without giving adequate time for its consideration. The rank and file of the membership of the railway brotherhoods themselves, being self-reliant, independent, and self-respecting men, as they are, must look with contempt upon the membership of this body if it surrenders its right to exercise its own judgment in this crisis. Every free American despises a truckler, even though at times he may make use of him to further his own selfish interests. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been unavoidably out of the city almost continuously since I addressed the House on the 15th of April with reference to this measure, and by reason of that unavoidable absence I have been unable to hear any of the addresses which have been delivered by those participating in the Hindenburg drive which was instituted about a week ago against the motion which I have made to discharge the committee and against the bill as a whole.

I shall not undertake in the 30 minutes which have been allotted to me, because I do not wish to ask for any more time, to go into any great detail about a description of this bill or the action of the committee in declining to consider it.

It has been attacked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENTON], who in his attack undertook to ride both ways by saying that he approved of the main features of the bill but doubted whether it ought to be considered.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] dragged their trail forms over the bill and over me in an effort not only to flatten it out physically but politically and legislatively as well, and I was somewhat astonished at what I saw in the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], which plainly evidenced the fact that he knew very little about the bill or unintentionally misinterpreted it.

The effort has been made here—the gentleman who has just spoken talked about propaganda, about members of labor organizations walking up and down the corridors of the House Office Building to intimidate Members of this House. Why, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the greatest propaganda that has ever been instituted by anybody with reference to this measure has been by those who have sought deliberately to misrepresent its provisions and to intimidate Members of Congress against voting for it or for the motion to take it away from the committee.

Telegrams have been pouring in here for weeks, and they are being delivered on the floor of this House at this very moment from organizations either of short-line railroads or independent organizations of employees who have been induced by the railroad companies, that financed their organizations, to bombard Congress into the belief that this bill is unjust to them, because they say it gives them no protection in its operation. I want to clear up a little misapprehension with reference to that.

During the strike of 1922 certain men took the positions of those who had ceased to be employees of the railroads. I am not going to discuss the merits of that controversy, but the strike of 1922 was brought about because the men who were involved in it were unable in anyway to compel the railroads, who deliberately disobeyed the decisions of the present Railroad Labor Board, to obey them, and if the men themselves disobeyed them the only remedy they had was either to get fired or voluntarily to quit, while the railroads that saw fit

to disobey could go unpunished, and there was no economic or legal power that could compel them to obey the decisions of the present Railroad Labor Board; and, as I pointed out the other day, they have violated its decisions in 148 cases, and yet there has been no violation on the part of the employees except by their voluntarily retiring from their employment or subjecting themselves to compulsory discharge on the part of the railroads themselves.

The strike of 1922 grew out of this situation. Men were gathered from the four corners of the country to take the places of those who had ceased to work, and after they had gotten in, many of the railroads organized these temporary employees who had taken the places of their regular employees who had quit work, because they found, as they thought, no remedy under the present law—they organized them into company unions. They financed their organizations and they are directing the propaganda that is coming in here to-day on the part of these independent organizations against this measure on the ground it gives them no protection.

If a controversy should arise between the independent employees or the unorganized employees of any railroad in the United States and the railroad, this machinery will be as available to them as the present machinery is, and will be more efficient and more economical and more just. These organizations have no representation on the present Railroad Labor Board. They have no power even to submit names to the President from whom he may select the three members to represent the employees on the present Railroad Labor Board.

Propaganda has been scattered here on the part of certain railroads and other interests that represent an unfriendly attitude to labor that if this bill is passed, it proposes to bring about what is known as the "closed shop" on the railroads of the United States. There is not a line—no member who has charged that interpretation has pointed to a single line or syllable in this bill that provides for that or even permits or looks toward the creation of what we know as a "closed shop" on the railroads of this country.

There is no such thing as a "closed shop" on the railroads of the United States. There never has been and in all probability there never will be because the conditions of labor that exist upon the transportation systems are entirely different from those which exist and obtain in the various manufacturing centers of the United States; and I am here to say to the credit of the organized part of railroad labor that there never has yet been a controversy that has arisen between the employees and the transportation companies, although the unorganized have no direct representation, where the interests of the unorganized classes were not cared for and sustained by the organized representatives of labor just as much as if they had been organized and had direct representation upon the boards that have settled these various disputes.

I want to speak now for just a few moments about the discharge of this committee.

Mr. STEVENSON. Before the gentleman leaves that point I want to say that we have heard a good many complaints from the short-line railroads that the law compels them to pay the same rates as the through lines and they will not be allowed to work out anything except that specifically adopted by the other roads.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is another form of propaganda that has been organized by many of the trunk lines. This bill does not in any particular affect the short-line railroads; it does not affect them any way different from the way they are now affected under the labor sections in the transportation act. They can go on and settle their labor questions on their own account, and they do settle them; they can employ such labor as they see fit under whatever terms they agree on. Of course, there are some short lines under the act regulating commerce under the interpretation of the law and the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission—under the law that deals with the railroads under the interstate commerce act they must deal with them all alike; they can not make exceptions. As a matter of fact the short lines have undertaken to misinterpret the law by saying that it is going to put them out of business. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] said it would put the short lines out of business. It will not affect them at all except favorably, because if they can not settle their own disputes by conference the bill sets up machinery which will be available to them if they choose to use it.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. KING. Would the gentleman be willing, if the committee would begin hearings on the bill at once, to permit this bill to go back to the committee for that purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that would be effective, because this committee would do just what it is doing with the truth in fabric bill—prolong the hearings until the Congress is about to adjourn, and then it will be too late.

Mr. KING. But if they give reasonable assurance that this will not be the case.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not had any reasonable assurance. If this bill should be sent back to the committee under any kind of instruction, it is dead. Gentlemen have stated that the public is not represented with reference to the boards provided by this act. I wish I had time to compare this bill with the present law. Both enjoin on the roads the settlement of their own disputes without resort to tribunals. Both provide for the appointment of adjustment boards. The difference is that the present law leaves it voluntary, while the bill makes it compulsory, and the reason is that many roads have refused to enter into an agreement with the employees to submit to expert technicians the question and let them iron out the grievances and disputes that arise during the operation of the roads.

They do not deal with wages or increase in compensation of employees. They do not deal with changes in the fundamental working conditions about which the public knows nothing and about which the public is not concerned. It is the settlement of disputes that arise in the interpretation of rules and working conditions which engages the attention of these adjustment boards.

When it comes to the settlement of wage conditions, they are dealt with by the board of five, which is drawn from the public, and the bill provides that there shall be no one on the board who is employed on or interested in the road. If anybody appointed on it should become financially interested in any railroad or becomes a member of any organization of employees, he automatically is disqualified as a representative on the board. So that the board that deals with the wage and working conditions is drawn entirely from the public.

Now let me get down to the committee. It has been stated here by one or two gentlemen that I have not as a member of the committee made diligent effort to secure consideration of the bill. It was stated yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] and a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that this is a political move, that politics had been interjected into this question. I ask either of the gentlemen to stand on his feet on the floor and say who first injected politics into this proposition. I have been a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee for 11 years, and it is the only committee I have been on since I have been a Member of this House.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. MAPES. My recollection is that the gentleman in discussing this bill referred to politics and partisanship for the first time since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will come to that. I have been a member of the committee for 11 years and have never been on any other committee. I never uttered a political syllable in the discussion of a bill that came out of the Interstate Commerce Committee since I was a Member of the House, and I challenge any man on the committee to say to the contrary. On the contrary, I have repeatedly over the objections of some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, and almost alone, fought for bills under previous Chairman Esch and under the present chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW].

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman referred to the discussion on the floor—

Mr. BARKLEY. I am coming to that. If the gentleman will wait, I will say what happened.

In January, before I had ever introduced this bill, I undertook to find out what was the program of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Many gentlemen here had introduced bills, and I was one of them, seeking to repeal or eliminate the surcharge upon Pullman cars, charged by the railroads of the country. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] had introduced a bill to repeal and modify section 15a of the transportation act. There were some 15 or 20 bills introduced at the very beginning of the session of Congress pertaining to the transportation act. Some time in January I undertook to secure from the chairman of the committee some statement as to the policy of the committee with reference to legislation, and the reply was that the President was working on something and he could not find out just what it was, and he wanted to wait until the President had formulated his

program. Weeks went on, probably six weeks, and nothing was said. The subject was never brought up again by the chairman until I again brought it up in the committee and asked that the committee hold an executive session to form its own program, because up until that time nothing had been brought in by the committee for consideration except what might be called chicken-feed legislation, with all of the important bills that were at that time pending before that committee. The thing was maneuvered around like a first baseman maneuvers to keep the runner from touching the sack, until weeks went by, and then I undertook again to bring it up in the committee. Finally we obtained an executive session of the committee after the delays and the maneuvers and the procrastinations on insignificant bills, some of them taking a week when a day was enough. Finally we got into executive session to formulate a program. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] had introduced a bill increasing the number of boiler inspectors. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] had introduced a bill providing for a general survey of railroad rates, and it was upon my motion that the Cooper bill was taken up.

I first moved that the Cooper bill be taken up first, that the Hoch bill be taken up second, and that my railroad labor bill be made the third bill on the program of the committee. The committee adopted the motion and took up the Cooper bill, and that was entirely agreeable. It adopted the motion to take up the Hoch bill, which was entirely agreeable; but when it came to the consideration of this labor proposition it was voted down, and immediately a motion was made to take up as the third proposition the truth in fabrics bill, and they began hearings on that bill on the 15th or 16th of April and they are still holding hearings, and, in my judgment, unless they make more progress in the future than they have in the past, when the Speaker raps the gavel for the last time to adjourn this session of Congress without day those hearings on the truth in fabrics bill will still be in progress, and if those who want that bill brought up before this House for consideration desire to get it here, they will have to get it, in my judgment, in the same manner in which I am trying to get the railroad labor bill before this House for consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. I would like to know who told the gentleman what is going on in the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am judging the future by the past. I have been unwilling to waste my time listening to witnesses who testified two years ago for nearly four weeks on this very same proposition, and by reason of the fact that I did not want to waste the committee's time I have not been present very much, if that is what the gentleman has reference to. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asked me a question. During these efforts on my part not only to have my bill considered but anybody's bill that affected the transportation act I did say something which possibly the gentleman from Michigan had in mind.

We have been commanded to wait and not to touch this sacred ox, the transportation act. Propaganda has come in here from all kinds of organizations, including commercial bodies, boards of trades from towns that do not even have a mayor or a policeman. We are told that we must not touch the transportation act, that we must let the railroads alone. This bill does not deal with the general provisions of the transportation act. It deals with Title III, and Title III might be cut out by the heart and it would not affect any other provisions of the transportation act. During the deliberations of the committee one day, perhaps in some disgust and with a little bit of resentment, because I had introduced this bill in good faith and not as a political measure—it was introduced in the Senate by a Republican and in the House by a Democrat in order that it might not be considered a partisan measure—during the efforts that I was making to get consideration of the bill, I did say that it might be unfortunate for the bill itself to have been introduced in the House by a Democrat and not by a Republican. I did say that, and that is all I said, and I said it after it had been made manifest that the bill would not be taken up by the committee. I have not taken a partisan view of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I do not want to do it now. Nothing pains me more than to be compelled to make this motion, because I have served on the committee for nine years with the genial chairman of the committee, and Mr. RAYBURN and I are the oldest members

of that committee by reason of service. I have the greatest respect and admiration and affection for the members of that committee with whom I have associated during the last 10 or 11 years, but there comes a time in legislative history sometimes when a man must forget all about his friendships in order that justice may be done and that measures may be considered that are entitled to consideration.

This motion to discharge the committee the members of the committee seem to take as a reflection upon their integrity. I assume that this rule was adopted for some purpose. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] referred yesterday to the fact that I opposed the adoption of the rule in the beginning providing for 100 men to sign a petition to make a motion for discharging the committee. I did oppose that and I stand by everything that I said at that time. I voted for the motion as it was amended, however, to provide for 150, and if I had known then that I would have to deal with such an obstinate, recalcitrant, and incorrigible committee as the one which dealt with this bill I would have voted for 100 instead of 150. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, on next Monday this motion will be voted on, and I tell you that if you want this bill to be considered the only way to get it is to vote for that motion. It will do no good to refer it back to the committee where it has been. Congress is about to adjourn. Everybody is trying to get away from here by June. You know that unless this bill is taken up under this discharge rule there will be no chance to secure consideration of it during the present session. The next session of Congress is the short session in December. It can not consider anything except appropriation bills. The next Congress will not meet in all probability until December of next year, so that unless this bill is taken from this committee and given such consideration as the House may see fit to give it under the rules of the House, there will be no chance for at least two years to consider a bill of this character, dealing, as it does, with great interests from one end of the Nation to the other.

Some gentleman has said that there was no emergency that demands this legislation. Why, there was a strike to which I referred in 1922 on which the Department of Justice alone spent more than \$2,000,000 in efforts to coerce a settlement of that strike, and the inefficiency, loss of time, and depreciation of railroad property cost the railroads of this country and the public together more than \$100,000,000. The time to legislate and settle labor disputes is not when there is a strike, not when the emergency is at hand, not when the cloud rises and is about to precipitate a catastrophe, but the time to legislate in reference to disputes is when there is no emergency, when we may approach the subject calmly and with a desire to do justice to all sides and create the machinery that may be resorted to by both sides when the emergency does arise with some confidence that its adjustment may be respected, and that it may be respected not through fear but through a desire to obey the law [applause] and a desire to bring peace not only in industry but in the transportation systems of the United States.

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. GILBERT. The impression was left on me by speakers opposing the rule that this was a step backward in that it eliminated public consideration. Do I understand the gentleman to say that under the theory in this bill in all matters affecting the public the public has more interest, in fact determines that matter exclusively?

Mr. BARKLEY. It has exclusive representation on the board. Neither side can be directly represented on the Board of Mediation and Conciliation. Mr. Speaker, how much more time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is there any board or tribunal created by the gentleman's proposed measure which has the power to investigate any disputes as to increase of wages unless the parties agree beforehand they shall do so?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, yes and no. The provisions of the original Erdman Act and the provisions of the Newlands Act, under which hundreds of disputes were settled and under which there was no nation-wide strike at any time subsequent to the enactment of either of those laws, were somewhat similar to the provisions in the bill now before the House in reference to the settlement of wage disputes. There is no compulsion upon either party to submit that dispute to the

Board of Mediation and Conciliation and there can not be any compulsion upon either party under the law unless you are going to take the whole step and prevent strikes by criminal prosecution and that has never been attempted successfully. Australia attempted such a law and it is a dead letter. Canada attempted it, and although under that law there have been hundreds of violations, there have been only 11 prosecutions, and that law is a dead letter in Canada. France undertook it, and the only way she could enforce a rigid compulsory provision of an antistrike law was if there was a strike to call the employees into the army and make them work as soldiers. But we can not do that and we ought not to attempt that in the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am not talking about antistrike legislation, but I am asking the gentleman if there is any tribunal under the proposed law which has the power to investigate and give to the public—independently of any agreement between parties—to give to the public their decision on the controversy irrespective of whether the decision is enforceable?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Board of Mediation is not a deciding body. It may be approached by either side or both sides, or it may offer its services and conduct investigations and give out to the public whatever it wants in reference to the facts, but it can not decide anything, and it ought not to decide anything, if you are going to leave it like the present Railroad Labor Board, without power to enforce its decisions.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I would like the gentleman to point to a single phrase in his bill that gives to the Board of Conciliation and Arbitration the power to make investigations and a determination unless the parties agree to it beforehand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand it has to do with a decision. It is a board of mediation to bring parties together in an effort to induce a settlement upon the basis of agreement and contract, and it does not provide that this board shall be superimposed upon the transportation systems of the country and render a decision that one side may obey and the other may disobey without its having power to force its decisions.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Then the gentleman agrees with me that there is no such tribunal provided for that can make such a decision?

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is not the real important question, when you come right down to the merits of your proposed bill and the present law, the question whether you want to take away from the Railroad Labor Board the power to make a decision, with the incidental result, of course, that if that decision appears fair and just to the public, the public opinion will enforce the decision? Under your bill you are going away back from that situation. And, as a matter of fact, is not the main element of the question to decide as to whether that is proper or not?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a question of distance and a question of the compass as to whether you are going back or forward. I think the present law brought you back to confusion, with the present board attempting, as Mr. Hoover said, to combine the functions of mediation with those of decision, but with no powers to mediate or to enforce decisions.

Mr. BURTNESS. I mean back in the way of practice, not in time.

Mr. BARKLEY. You go backward when you create an agency in which neither side has full confidence, and you go forward when you make it easy for both sides to be drawn together in confidence and respect. If the Congress of the United States desires to amend the bill in any provision, it has the right to do it.

Nobody has undertaken to create the impression, except those who are against the bill, that we are trying to drive it down your throats without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." I myself am going to offer amendments to the bill if it is brought up for consideration. I say it is important enough to entitle it to consideration, and on Monday, without regard to party or the efforts of men on either side to crack the party whip, a majority of the House will, I trust, decide to discharge the committee and bring this measure before the House, where it can consider it under appropriate rules. [Applause.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8839, the District appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] will please resume the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8839) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8839, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8839) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear what the Clerk read. What was it?

The CHAIRMAN. It was merely the title of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not hear a word that he read.

The CHAIRMAN. There was nothing pending when the committee rose yesterday. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenses necessary and incident to the enforcement of an act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, including personal services when authorized by the commissioners, \$2,452, including an allowance at the rate of \$26 per month for furnishing an automobile for the performance of official duties.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the following language: Page 14, line 19, against the following: "including an allowance at the rate of \$26 per month for furnishing an automobile for the performance of official duties."

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that no official of this Government and no employee of this Government is entitled to any allowance for an automobile that is not authorized by law. There is absolutely no law whatever for this. I appeal to the Chair on this point that there should be legislation before we allow it. Otherwise there might be a Congress some day that would want to give a Pierce-Arrow limousine to every one of the 300,000 employees of this Government. There ought to be some way of stopping it by points of order in accordance with the rules of this House that have prevailed for a hundred years. I submit that that is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the act referred to, an act authorizing the District of Columbia to remove unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes, in section 1 provides that if in the District of Columbia any building or part of building, and so forth, is reported unsafe the inspector of buildings shall examine such structure; and if in his opinion the same shall be unsafe, he shall immediately notify the owner, and so forth. And section 3 provides that whenever a report of a certain survey shall declare a certain structure to be unsafe and the owner refuses in three days to cause such structure to be taken down, the inspector shall proceed to make such structure safe, and so forth. There is a duty imposed on the inspector of buildings to carry out the provisions of that act, and Congress of course has the authority to give an expense fund for that purpose and has the same authority to provide an automobile for the use of that inspector in making his visitations and his going about the city; the same right that it has to provide him with stationery and postage, and so forth.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course not, because stationery and postage are incidental to office work, and it is official, but an automobile is not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Right there the gentleman has brought the issue to the point, that if it is incidental to the proper performance of the authority given to the official, we may appropriate for it; and in carrying on the work in the District of Columbia, 10 miles square, barring what was given back to Virginia, it is self-evident that in the performance of that duty some means of transportation is necessary, and it is for Congress to decide whether an automobile is better than a street car.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, of course, we could furnish a Pierce-Arrow limousine if Congress saw fit to vote for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, when the committee proposes it, it will be time enough to talk about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved May 1, 1906, as cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], is a general act. It gives broad and comprehensive powers to a board, to be known as the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, to do certain things in and about the District in the examination and condemnation of insanitary buildings, a very useful work and a necessary adjunct to the government of such a place as the District of Columbia.

Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] states, in support of his point of order, that an allowance for an automobile would not be permissible and in order, unless there was some authority of law for the hiring of an automobile. The Chair can not see how that can follow. Would it be contended, for instance, that it would be necessary, before the Congress could appropriate for stationery for typewriting purposes, that there must be authority given by law to the board to buy typewriting machines?

Mr. BLANTON. If it were not for the law, this Congress could not furnish a Congressman with his stationery allowance. There is a legislative statute which authorizes it, and if it were not for that legislative statute we Congressmen would be without a stationery allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but there is no law which authorizes the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings to buy typewriters, to buy vehicles, or buy office furniture, specifically stating it, but it is commonly conceded that they must have that right, otherwise they could not function. So it must be true that if it is necessary for them to use an automobile they ought to have the right to do so, and if they can buy an automobile it follows that Congress may appropriate a reasonable amount for the maintenance of the automobile. That is always true when Congress gives broad, general powers and does not restrict and limit those powers, and Congress has not done so in this case.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the Chair will permit, as a matter of fact, there is probably nothing in the law which directly authorizes the employment of personal services.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees nothing of the kind in it, and the Chair has the act before him.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But such an appropriation is made in this language:

Including personal services when authorized by the commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not closely examined the statute, but it is sufficient to say the board is authorized to inspect and examine buildings. Now, the Chair must adhere to his former conclusion. If a department is authorized by law to perform certain duties, it must necessarily follow, unless Congress has limited it, that that department must have the necessary things with which to do its business and the Congress may appropriate for such purposes. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment merely for the purpose of finding out where we are at. At the end of the paragraph, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following proviso:

Provided, That in the performance of his duties, every official connected with this department shall be furnished with a Pierce-Arrow limousine, and to cover the expense thereof there is hereby appropriated \$500,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, we have gotten somewhere, then.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of offices of the recorder of deeds, including services of cleaners as necessary, not to exceed 30 cents per hour, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$6,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: On page 15, line 4, strike out "\$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,400."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this pertains to the building in which the office of the recorder of deeds is

located. It has been a known fact to all those who have investigated at all that for quite a number of years there has not been sufficient room in the two rooms they occupy on the first floor to carry on the business of the office. They are much in arrears now and it is because there is not space there in which to put a sufficient number of employees.

The original amount in the bill was \$8,000, and is for rent and the services of cleaners.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and others, have been down there and investigated that building. The parties who own the building have threatened to remove—and I think they can properly remove—the recorder of deeds office forthwith from that building. The proposition they make now is that they will rent the entire building and furnish heat, light, janitor service, elevator service, and everything else, for the sum of \$14,400, and this committee feels confident that it is the best solution that can be had at this time. It gives us the entire building.

Of course, in the near future, Mr. Chairman, two or three years from now, there will be a building in this city, a new building near the court house, for the recorder of deeds office, but in the interim there is no question but what they must have more room, and this gives them two additional floors and sufficient room for the sum of \$14,400.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Committee on Appropriations, embracing 35 members, is one of the most peculiar committees you ever saw. Without any authority of Congress they exercise the right continually of putting legislation in an appropriation bill at will. They have no authority to do it, but they do it, and when one of us exercises his prerogative of enforcing the rules and makes a point of order against such improper legislation they have 47 spasms, but whenever they want to introduce legislation in the way of an amendment they do it. They do it and they do not want you to make any point of order against it. Now, they get a little out of humor when I call attention to these matters which are legislation, and when the Chair sustains them under the rules they get out of humor.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that he can make a point of order against this if he wants to and as many more as he wants to make.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield to the gentleman. He is disobeying the rules now.

But when I offer, Mr. Chairman, an amendment that would benefit every man, woman, and child in this District, to restrict the street-car companies to their charter rights and not permit them to charge over 5-cent fares here, when their charter restricts them to 5-cent fares, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan gets up and makes a point of order against it and will not even let the House vote on it. The idea of charging 70,000 little school children here in this District 8 cents car fare, when most of the cities of the United States are charging 5 cents for adults and charging school children half price. They are now charging 8 cents apiece street-car fare for the 70,000 school children of this District.

Oh, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] introduced an amendment here the other day that slightly changes the fiscal plan of this District. It is true he only raised the tax rate a few pennies, raising it from \$1.20 to about \$1.30, when other people everywhere else are paying \$3.75; but when he does that the newspapers come out and tell us about who is going to stop it. They even name the individual who is going to put an end to that matter in this bill. They say he is not going to stand for it. He is going to have the Cramton amendment put out of this bill and is going to keep the tax rate here at \$1.20. I thought maybe you would like to see where that individual lives. I can not mention his name, because the rules of the House prohibit it, but here is where the gentleman lives. I can show you this picture of his fine residence here in Washington, and if he succeeds in beating the Cramton amendment he pays just \$1.20 on this fine property instead of \$1.30.

I want to tell you that the time has come in this great city when every Congressman and every Senator who votes for that ridiculous \$1.20 tax rate to continue at the time he votes for it ought to put in the Record, in fairness to his constituents, the value of his property that he owns here in Washington and the assessment and the tax rate and the measly little pittance of taxes that he pays on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, I have a list of every Congressman and every Senator in Washington who owns property here; and I have a list of his property and I have a list of the taxes he pays. I have not put it in the Record because it would not look nice for me to do it. Many Congressmen and Senators here who own property do not approve of this low tax rate. I do not want to make the others angry, but if they continue to keep this \$1.20 tax rate here when the people of the United States are paying \$3.75 all over this land I am going to put it in the Record some time as sure as you live, and I am going to let the people of this country know who it is that is benefiting here when they vote to keep the tax rate at \$1.20.

I am going to let the people of this country know about it. Is not that right? Is there anything wrong about that? I do not think they are going to vote out this Cramton amendment; but if they do, it does not amount to very much for the people who live here, as the increase is slight. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has not done much for the country in increasing the tax rate from \$1.20 to \$1.30. He ought to have accepted my amendment and put the tax rate here at \$2.50, like it was a few years ago, and not let it be kept down to \$1.20 on the \$100 assessed at about 50 per cent of a real valuation.

I challenge one Congressman or one Senator to show that his property is assessed at more than 60 per cent of the cash market value of it right now. He can not do it. Property here is assessed at from 40 to 60 per cent of the real value and then taxed at only \$1.20 per \$100, and we ought to stop it. It is not fair to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring the discussion back to the amendment before the committee, namely, to increase the appropriation for the quarters occupied by the recorder of deeds from \$6,000 to \$14,400.

On this subject I merely want to say I had occasion recently to go down to the recorder of deeds' office to inspect a document which had been recorded there. I never saw a public office so congested in my life. I never saw men working in a public office under such cramped and almost impossible conditions as exist there. There is practically no room for desks and furniture, and the documents which have been recorded have to be put away in most inconvenient and inaccessible places.

I am glad the amendment has been offered and hope it will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, calamity by flood or fire or storm, and of like character; and in all cases of emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, in the discretion of the commissioners, \$4,000; *Provided*, That in the purchase of all articles provided for in this act no more than the market price shall be paid for any such articles, and all bids for any such articles above the market price shall be rejected and new bids received or purchases made in open market, as may be most economical and advantageous to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the following language: "And in all cases of emergency otherwise sufficiently provided for in the discretion of the commissioners."

Mr. Chairman, that is new legislation. It was not in the last appropriation bill. It has never been put in any appropriation bill. It is something new that our friends have put in this bill for the first time.

Mr. AYRES. That is put in the bill to cover cases of emergency. For instance, take the death of President Harding. They were absolutely helpless because they had no funds to cover the expense of that funeral. This is simply to take care of matters of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman from Kansas know that whenever any official of the Government dies, of that importance, the Sergeant at Arms of the House and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Clerk of the House and the disbursing officer of the Senate get together and arrange for the funeral?

Mr. AYRES. They do not as far as policing the District.

Mr. BLANTON. If Congress were not in session and a Member should die, our friend the Sergeant at Arms would take charge of his body and send it to his home. He would desig-

nate the ones to go with it. He is authorized to do that by law and pay the expenses out of the contingent fund of the House. That is the law of the land when Congress is not in session.

Mr. BEGG. If this goes out on a point of order, would it not meet the gentleman's objection to strike out the words in the item "such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, calamity by flood, fire, or storm, and of like character" and leave it a straight emergency?

Mr. AYRES. We put it in to cover these emergencies, and it was said at the time that it would give somebody an opportunity to talk, and that would be all there was of it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to a point of order. It is simply a broadening of the proposition. The hearings give as an instance of the need for this the Knickerbocker disaster where many of the fire engines were put out of order. It covers any emergency that may come up where there is necessity for a small emergency fund.

Mr. AYRES. Take the Knickerbocker disaster where the fire apparatus went back on them.

Mr. CRAMTON. We put the language in not to broaden the authority of the commissioners but to give them some money to use in cases of emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not had much time to look this up. This is an item of appropriation to be used as an emergency fund for the District of Columbia. What is there in the law that prohibits Congress from establishing an emergency fund for any department?

Mr. BLANTON. Congress provides for the expenditure of every dollar that is authorized to be taken out of the Treasury by the Appropriation Committee. If there is no authorization for the fund, the Appropriation Committee has no right to appropriate money for it. It ought to be appropriated only when there is specific authority to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is an appropriation for an emergency fund. The Chair believes that it is a legitimate function of Congress to make such a fund if it wants to do so. For instance, Chairman Walsh on February 10, 1921, decided that an appropriation for an emergency, an extraordinary expenditure in the Navy Department, was in order as a necessary incident to the operation of the department. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 6, after the word "character," strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, after the word "all," insert the word "other."

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Chairman, I do this because it has been held that general language followed by specific language will be interpreted to mean instances of the same general class. The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

REFUND OF ERRONEOUS COLLECTIONS

To enable the commissioners, in any case where special assessments, school tuition charges, rents, fees, or collections of any character have been erroneously covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in the proportion that the appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved were or are paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia, to refund such erroneous payments, wholly or in part, including the refunding of fees paid for building permits authorized by the District of Columbia appropriation act approved March 2, 1911, \$1,500: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for such refunds of payments made within the past three years.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 6, after the word "proportion," strike out the language "that the appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved were or are paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia" and insert in lieu thereof "required by law."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, that does not change the effect at all; but if some change was made in the first section of the bill, there would be no conflict by reason of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of the District of Columbia, \$300,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is not authorized by law, that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear any argument. The point of order is overruled. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of special typewriting equipment, typewriters, cards, and file cases, for the use of the offices of the assessor and collector of taxes, to be immediately available, \$5,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law, and that it is additional to the appropriation bill of last year. It is new matter that was not in the last District appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, whether it was in the last appropriation bill or not is immaterial. If it was in and was then legislation it is still subject to the point of order now, and if it is not legislation the fact that it was not in a former bill has nothing to do with the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not want to seem to be at all brusque or to dismiss these matters without consideration. The Chair has endeavored on several occasions to express his ideas about matters which were necessary for the conduct of an office which is authorized by law. When these points of order are raised, if any are raised in the future, the Chair will not go into his reasons for so holding. It is sufficient to say that the Chair thinks that he has expressed his opinion. The Chair is of opinion that such things as are necessary to carry on these legally constituted offices can be appropriated for, and therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some time ago I went down to the collector's office and I was taken into his vaults by one of his assistants and saw there on the floor in his vault four open-top wooden boxes full of letters with checks and money attached to them, sent there in payment of taxes; checks that had been there for over a month, not cashed, lying there on the floor in those boxes. I asked him why it was and he said that they had not been able to reach them, that they did not have enough employees. The people who sent those checks there could have died or become insolvent before their checks were presented to the bank for payment. Do you know what my secretary would have done if he had been working in that office? He would have stayed there until 1 or 2 o'clock at night and on Sunday but what he would have gotten those checks filed, credited, and deposited, and he would not have done it because I told him to do it, but he would have done it from a sense of duty to his country. The idea of leaving for over a month four boxes full of checks there, together with money sent for the payment of taxes! I asked him how long they had been there and he said over a month. They ought to get some old-fashioned Yankee thrift into the business enterprises and business transactions of this District government.

Back of my house is an alley which runs behind five different houses on a down-hill grade, a very steep incline, and it has never been paved. When it rains hard the water runs away from that alley into the cellars of five different families there. About two years ago I got after the commissioners to stop that if they could. They said that they would pave the alley, and they began to send assistant engineers up there, two or three together, from time to time, and they began to look at it and make plans. It is just a little alley, about as far as from here to that door. I could have gone out there I believe myself and paved it with the assistance of a few laborers in a week. That was about two years ago that this trouble with the water began. They had been sending up there on several occasions. Finally they had a fine plan all mapped out and it was to have terraced steps down that alley. I saw how much it was going to cost and how much red tape there was to it, and I said, "For God's sake let it alone; we people will stand it if it is going to put the Government to all of that expense; stop it." And they did stop it at our request. The idea of messing around with business like that! They need some New England Yankee thrift in the conduct of their business affairs.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Or Illinois thrift?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Or Texas thrift?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Or Michigan thrift?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. They ought to put some business thrift into the conduct of their government in this District.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving Varnum Street, Second Street to Fourth Street, 30 feet wide, \$11,600.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill. This same point of order affects all of these paving cases, provisions, from line 8 on page 17 down to line 8 on page 22, and will be made by me after each provision is read. It is all legislation. I do not want to repeat the point of order after the reading of each little paragraph, and I am willing to have the Chair pass on all of it at one time. It takes legislation to pave these streets. There is a legislative District Committee here to provide for it. There has not been a single representation made to the legislative committee asking for this paving. They do not come to the legislative committee, but they come to the Committee on Appropriations. They ought to be taught to come to the legislative committee for legislative matters, and it is the integrity of the jurisdiction of these legislative committees for which I am contending.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the Government owns all of these streets. Some of them have already been paved and need repaving, and some of them partially paved and need to be finished. In every case it is a continuation of a work in progress. Furthermore, the law provides that hereafter the commissioners, in submitting schedules of streets and avenues to be improved, shall each year recommend such streets and avenues in the order of their importance, as determined by them after personal examination of said streets and avenues, and there are other provisions as to how the streets shall be paved and how they shall be graded. I refer to Thirty-second Statutes, page 962. The statute clearly contemplates the paving of the streets and provides how the estimates shall be prepared. It is continuation of a work in progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The statute referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] specifies how the estimates shall be made to Congress, and provides that in submitting the schedules of streets and avenues to be improved the commissioners shall arrange such streets and avenues in the order of their importance, and so forth. That estimate, of course, goes to the Congress. Then the Congress passes upon the matter as to how far it shall go in providing the money for these purposes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says that special authority should be given by the District Committee for such work. However, the Chair finds on a hasty examination of the authorities as given in the House Manual the following citations which the Chair has not had time to look up, but assumes properly bear out the syllabus:

But appropriations for rent and repairs of buildings, for Government roads, and purchase have been admitted as in continuation of a work, although it is not in order as such to provide for a new building in place of one destroyed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair yield right there for an explanation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a Government road, for instance, like the Military Road we own over in Arlington or like the one down at Camp Meade. These are streets, if the Chair please, and the contiguous property owners are taxed. In other words, under the present Borland law, passed in 1914, every contiguous property owner is taxed for the pavement of 20 feet contiguous to his property. This is not a Government road; it is a public street, just as public as any street in Philadelphia or New York. The public has as much interest in it as in the streets of New York and Philadelphia and the property owners are taxed. That is one reason why there should be a hearing before the legislative District Committee. These property owners might come in and say that there is no emergency for paving this particular street that would warrant their having to pay for this 20 feet of their own property.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I call the attention of the Chair to how far the Chair has gone in the past with reference to work in progress. I recall the case of the topographic survey of the United States where an appropriation for its extension was held to have reference to a work in progress. Now, the pavement of the streets of the city is work in progress. Every single one of these pavements is to connect with an existing system of paving. There will be no breaks whatever. Every pavement to be laid under this paragraph will connect up immediately with the existing system of pavement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has referred to the opinion in Fourth Hinds, paragraph 3779, which was a proposition to repair a pavement originally laid in that case in the city of Chicago, where a pavement had been laid by the Government adjacent to a Federal building in that city. The opinion was by Mr. WATSON, now Senator WATSON, of Indiana, and it goes off on the proposition entirely as to whether this road was a Government road—that is, whether the fee of the road was in the Government or not—holding by implication that if the fee was in the Government, then it was a work in progress, but inasmuch as the fee was in the city of Chicago a point of order was good against such an appropriation. Now, the fee of the streets of the District of Columbia is in the United States; they are Government roads, existing works. Corpus Juris (vol. 18, p. 1373) cites the authorities upon this proposition, citing principally *Morris v. United States* (174 U. S. 196). The point of order is overruled.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving Princeton Place, Warder Place to Georgia Avenue, 30 feet wide, \$10,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining about the ruling of the Chair, because I believe the Chair is conscientious, but I am making this point of order merely to give the Chair a chance to straighten out the inaccuracy which he has fallen into from a conscientious belief in his position. Here is Princeton Place. This is to pave streets of this addition to the city of Washington. The fee to these streets is not in the Government, as the Chair indicated. Most of these streets, as the Chair will find, the dedications of those streets and additions are to the District of Columbia and not to the Government of the United States. This is the District of Columbia entity here that exists; it is Washington, D. C., not the Government of the United States. The Government has the seat of government in the District of Columbia, but every street here, every one of these additions here, the Chair will find the fee is in the District of Columbia; and I do not want the Chair's opinion to stay here in the RECORD as indicating that these streets belong to the Government, when everybody knows that they do not. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Minnesota ought not to pull the Chair into such an error. They ought to enlighten him and give him the benefit of the facts before he makes a ruling here that is to stand as a precedent in this House for all time and eternity.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, our activities are chiefly to protect the Chair from being led into error by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I know the gentleman when he wants legislation he puts it in and when he does not want it in he keeps it out. I understand the gentleman's modus operandi, and, of course, the committee backs him up in it, and he backs his brother members on the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$482,750; to be disbursed and accounted for as "Street Improvements," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund, and shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be used for the improvement of any street or section thereof not herein specified.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do it for the purpose of asking the Chairman whether this is all that is appropriated for paving purposes in the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. There are \$550,000 on the next page.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. These are all of the specific items. There is repair paving and things of that sort, and these are simply specific new items.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will give the gentleman full statistics: Street improvements, specific improvements, \$482,750; repairs to streets, avenues and alleys, \$573,300; repairs in outlying sections, \$275,000; assessment and permit work, \$285,000; other miscellaneous items, \$250,320; making a total of \$1,876,370. I have given the gentleman the exact figures. The gentleman has read the papers, I guess.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I have not. But I have been traveling over the pavements, and I can say of all towns of this size or even very much smaller than Washington I never saw one that had such poor paving.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There has been a vast building improvement made in the city of Washington in the last few years.

There are more items in this bill, two to one, than the bill has ever carried in recent years. We have fifty-odd items here.

You can not put them all in one bill, because it would bankrupt the Treasury of the United States and of the District of Columbia; but we are taking them up just as fast as we can, consistently with the rules and with the money that is available.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is all right about his figures, but he is wrong about my not having ridden over the streets in the last few years.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Of course, our committee has gone around and viewed every item recommended by the commissioners and by the Budget, and the items in the bill are the ones that in our opinion are the most important and the most needed. Heretofore, I will say, most of these improvements have gone down into the northwest portion of the city, in the so-called wealthier part; but recently there have been a lot of new and small buildings put up in the northeast section. That is the reason why we put these in. Probably the gentleman has ridden out in the northeast. The gentleman will find that it will be necessary to provide for as many or more items in next year's bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute left.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. What is the question? I do not want to hold up the committee more than is necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. This is more than \$800,000 that we are providing for the streets here. The taxpayers out in Iowa, where the tall corn grows, and in other States, pay approximately 40 per cent of this amount.

Mr. BEGG. No; 20 per cent. I will explain it to the gentleman when I get the floor.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Out in Iowa the taxpayers pay all the cost of the pavements. But it seems to me that the bad condition of the pavements is almost universal throughout the city here. Here and there you may find good pavements, but they are pretty rare.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. On page 22, line 9, I move to strike out "\$482,750" and insert "\$600,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 9, strike out "\$482,750" and insert "\$600,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is not only unauthorized by legislation but it is an increase. If the Chair is taking the last year's legislative bill as the authority, it is an increase over that item, and it is unauthorized by law.

Mr. BEGG. What are you making the point of order against?

Mr. BLANTON. Against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BEGG. Now, Mr. Chairman, the main reason why I offered this amendment—I am sincere and think we ought to appropriate it—is to call attention to the same fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] called attention to, namely, the unreasonable and unnecessary condition of the streets in the city. This bill carries \$110,000 less money for new streets than it carried last year.

Now, the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the people back home are paying so much of this is not correct. They pay 20 cents on the dollar for new pavements and no more, and if the Federal Government's damage to those streets does not represent 20 per cent of the wear, then there is no justification at all for levying any tax against the Federal Government.

I think that the policy of parsimony that has been practiced by the Congress toward nearly everything in the city of Washington is a wrong policy. I would like to see the streets in Washington and the schoolhouses the best that there are in any city in the country. What I said the other day about the schoolhouses I now say about both schoolhouses and the streets. There is not a city of 500,000 inhabitants in the United States anywhere where the streets are in as horrible condition as they are in this city and where the schoolhouses are in such a shameful condition.

Why? The only reason is that we come here and talk about the part of the Federal Government's upkeep. If the Federal Government should not pay it, let us change the system in some way, so that the people who live on the streets and send their children to school may have the opportunity to have the streets and the schools in as good condition as they are in other cities, and pay for them.

What is the condition now? If every property holder on a street wants to have that street improved what is the process? Why, in other cities if they petition the city government, the city government never turns them down if there is a big enough representation of the property holders.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. When I am through with this statement I will yield. But in the city of Washington, if every citizen resident on a street wants a pavement, and even if the street is in such bad condition that you could not drive a two-horse wagon through it, let alone an automobile, and if they do not satisfy five men on the District Committee, they have no recourse and no appeal. And I want to say to you that that is the most outrageous condition that ever existed in any city in the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I can contribute a little illumination.

Mr. BEGG. I do not think the gentleman can contribute any illumination on that proposition. Those are the facts of the case.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, it used to be that abutting property contributed nothing, and everybody wanted to improve the streets. Since we required a contribution from abutting property I asked the District authorities a week ago what was their practice. Did they wait until they received a petition from the property owners, or did they proceed without one? He said:

We proceed without them, because, since the Borland amendment, we never get a request.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. "The gentleman from Ohio" did not say what the gentleman was talking about. I said if every citizen did petition for a street—

Mr. CRAMTON. But they never do.

Mr. BEGG. But I know better. The gentleman can not tell me about what I know about. Now, then, a situation like that, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, is absolutely unfair, to deny property holders an improved street if they are willing to pay for it.

Now, there is just one other comment I want to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I ask for two minutes more in order to make that comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. When they do improve a street in the city of Washington, if it is by any other method than a pavement, they will haul out and dump ashes in it, and when the ashes dry out and the water they dump on the ashes dries out, and a wind comes up it beats any alkali storm I ever heard of or read about. If they would dump that same load of ashes in any other city in the United States that I know anything about they would be arrested before they got off the premises.

Now, I do this not to criticize the committee nor anybody else. The committee is only an agency of the machinery we set up through which the people may secure their improvements, but I make these remarks in order to call attention to a condition which I think is outrageous as regards the citizenship of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is mistaken. Under the Borland Act, which was passed in 1914, every property owner contributes for the paving of 20 feet in the street. The Government and the District pay the balance 60-40. To pay that balance, 60-40, this \$1,800,000 is appropriated in this bill, of which the taxpayers of the country pay approximately 40 per cent, if the gentlemen's amendment is adopted; but if it is not adopted then they pay the full 40 per cent.

You know, gentlemen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is the cutest man in this House. [Laughter.] He knows that if he gets up here on the floor—

Mr. SNELL. He admits it.

Mr. BLANTON. He does not have to admit it. We all know it.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the section.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will keep himself within the rules. I know the rules, Mr. Chairman. As to knowledge about everything that exists in the world the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg] is the last word, and he admits it. He knows that if he makes this speech for Washington his picture will be in every paper in Washington, and they will all be for Begg, while everybody who is against the amendment will be cussed by these newspapers. Naturally, he wants his picture in the papers. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it seems that the Northwest has been adequately taken care of in the preceding sections of this bill which have just been read. I know nothing about these conditions, but I was down in the Southwest the other evening, and I saw something which I feel should be called to the attention of the men who are in charge of this bill, because these men are in charge of the District. I refer to a carnival which had its tents pitched down there and had set itself up to demoralize the youth of this city. [Applause.] I find that this bill appropriates hundreds of thousands of dollars for schools, parks, playgrounds, and police protection, yet at the same time it seems the District allows carnivals to come here and set up 47 gambling devices and a lot of fake shows, where they have snake eaters, wild men, and other things which certainly do not contribute in the least to the edification or welfare of the community. It seems to me the persons in charge of the District of Columbia should see that conditions like that do not prevail in any community. [Applause.] What I saw the other evening was a disgrace to any community, much less a city of the size and standing of this great city, the Capital of our Nation.

I certainly and sincerely hope that what I say to-day will go to the persons who are in charge of the District of Columbia and that they will see to it that carnivals are not allowed to come here that do not have some standing in the community.

I am glad to say that all of the carnivals which come to the city are not like the one I saw in the Southwest.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I will say that is a question for the legislative committee and not for the Appropriations Committee. That legislative committee has not much to do, and I suggest the gentleman take it up with them.

Mr. BLANTON. We have lost all jurisdiction since the Appropriations Committee assumed charge of affairs.

Mr. AYRES. I agree with what the gentleman from West Virginia has been saying.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. As I say, all of the carnivals which come to the city are not like the one I saw in the Southwest. I attended a carnival at Fifteenth and H Streets NE. recently which had some elements of respectability about it. I know there are carnivals of that kind in the country, and certainly only this kind should be allowed to come here and the revenue derived from such carnivals gives splendid regulatory powers. And yet this carnival that exists down in Southwest Washington here, on South Capitol Street, would be a positive disgrace to any community and it seems to me the District authorities should do something to see that such disgraceful shows are not allowed to pitch their tents within the confines of the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry out the provisions contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914 which authorize the commissioners to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose during the fiscal year 1925, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation unauthorized in

an appropriation bill. Mr. Chairman, no paragraph that authorizes an unlimited appropriation ought ever to be adopted by this committee. In other words, there is no limitation whatever placed on this appropriation. It provides "there is appropriated such sum," and so forth, and of course it is without any limitation or restriction. This was merely in an appropriation act back in 1914 and is not legislative authority for this bill. It was authority simply for that year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, of course, if the proper language is used an item can be legislation as much in an appropriation act as any other place provided it is kept in the act and does not go out on a point of order.

In 1914 a certain paragraph was put in the act, which I will not take the time to read further than to say that it does authorize the commissioners to open up, extend, and widen streets, and so forth. Legislation having been passed by Congress, the paragraph before us simply provides the money to carry out that legislative enactment, and the fact that the amount is indefinite rather than definite, of course, does not render it subject to a point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is wholly paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, anyway.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Would this authorize the opening of new streets—for example, opening a street through Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course.

Mr. CRAMTON. It would give no authority except such as was given by the act of 1914. That act says:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, adopted under the act of Congress approved March 2, 1893, as amended—

And so forth—

by condemnation under the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the code of law for the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the entire amount found to be due and awarded by the jury under such proceedings as damages for and in respect of the land condemned, plus the cost and expenses of said proceedings, shall be assessed by the jury as benefits.

The paragraph before us, as the gentleman will see, is not an enlargement at all. It says to carry out the provisions of the statute which I have just read hurriedly in part, which authorizes the commissioners to open and extend highways, there is appropriated such amount as is necessary for said purpose during the fiscal year 1925. They used for this purpose \$26,477.58 last year, and that is about what it runs ordinarily.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman is well aware of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs in the last Congress had a bill before it to prohibit the opening of Fourteenth Street through the Walter Reed Hospital grounds.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is in the city of Washington and this does not apply within the cities of Georgetown and Washington.

Mr. MCKENZIE. It is in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; this says outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Do you say the Walter Reed Hospital is in the city of Washington or in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is right. It is in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCKENZIE. It is in the District of Columbia, as I understand it. Following that, realizing the opposition that existed in the Committee on Military Affairs and the opposition of the Surgeon General of the United States Army to the proposition of opening Fourteenth Street through these grounds, they introduced a bill which went to the District of Columbia Committee and was reported out, and owing to opposition to the bill in the last Congress it was not finally acted upon. In this Congress there has been such a bill introduced and reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia and it is now on the calendar. There are some of us who believe in preserving the integrity of the Walter Reed Hospital grounds who have been watching that bill, hoping this Congress would defeat it. The only thing I am interested in is whether or not this provision in this bill is so written that it will permit these gentlemen in Washington to go ahead and do that which in my judgment the Congress of the United States does not want done, and that is the opening of Fourteenth Street through the grounds at Walter Reed Hospital.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, during all these years during which they have been agitating the Fourteenth Street proposition, this provision has been in the law year after year, and it is to be assumed that if the language were sufficiently broad to reach the case the gentleman has in mind, they would never have come to Congress for such authority. I am not familiar sufficiently with the facts, but my explanation would be that that extension is not a part of the permanent plan of the District of Columbia which is referred to in the statute. The statute I have read does not permit this money to be used for an extension of a street except in accordance with the permanent highway plan of the District.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not wish to quarrel with the committee or to delay the committee, and I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the committee if they will accept the following amendment, which will correct the whole thing, and that is, in line 25, after the word "highway," insert "except the Fourteenth Street extension." That will remove all question about it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have no objection to it—none whatever. It does not apply to such an extension, and I have no objection to your putting it in.

Mr. CRAMTON. If it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Minnesota, it is to me; but there is this danger: The present highway plan does not include this proposition or a good many other things that have been proposed. Now, to say here they may do anything that is in that statute except the Fourteenth Street matter, which is not within the statute, is a pretty cumbersome mixing up of the law.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Michigan, who has control of the bill, having agreed to the amendment, I presume the gentleman from Illinois will permit my point of order to be overruled.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not passing on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The provisions of the statute, 37 Statutes at Large, page 950, was contained in the District of Columbia appropriation bill of 1914. The only question for the Chair to decide is whether that was permanent legislation or simply for the year.

Mr. BLANTON. Does it say "hereafter"?

The CHAIRMAN. This is the language of the act of 1914:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown—

And so forth—

adopted under the act of Congress approved March 2, 1893, as amended by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1898—

And so forth.

Therefore they are authorized to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway in accordance with that plan. Of course, such language means that they are authorized to do it at any time, and any other contention would seem to the Chair unjustified. The Chair thinks it was permanent legislation. He is further sustained in this ruling by the ruling of Chairman Hicks in Committee of the Whole in passing on the widening of a street in the District of Columbia, who said that the widening of the street was authorized in accordance with the act of 1914. That decision was made in 1923 on a subsequent appropriation bill, and the Chair thinks it was sound. There can be no doubt that this was permanent legislation. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, to insert in line 25, after the word "highway," the words "except the Fourteenth Street extension."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McKENZIE: Page 22, line 25, after the word "highway," insert the words "except the Fourteenth Street extension."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid of that, and I am going to ask the gentleman if he insists on that to put in the words "and Piney Branch extension." Let the amendment cover both.

Mr. McKENZIE. Very well; I will modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will be modified and again reported. The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment by Mr. McKENZIE: Page 22, line 25, after the word "highway," insert the words "except the Fourteenth Street extension and the Piney Branch Road extension."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: At the end of the McKenzie amendment, add the following proviso:

Provided, That the authority given in the act of 1914 is not hereby in any way extended.

If you are going to put in these two exceptions, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, it opens up every street in the District of Columbia, both in old Georgetown and the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment of Mr. McKENZIE: "Provided, That the authority given in the act of 1914 is not hereby in any way extended."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think, as this is an important matter, we ought to have a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will state that if the point of order is withdrawn we will put the gentleman's amendment in a new paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. If it is adopted in the way the gentleman has offered it, it is right in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well; I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment at the end of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 23, line 5, after the word "Columbia," insert "Provided, That the authority given in the act of 1914 is not hereby in any way extended."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completion of trestle and bins in N Street NE., between First Street and Second Street, \$20,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph first and then the gentleman's amendment can be reported.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to withhold the amendment until the point of order is determined.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a new item, lines 12 and 13, not carried in the last year's appropriation bill, and while it provides for completion, yet there is a fund provided to build a trestle and bins at N Street NE.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in the act of October, 1922, we appropriated \$20,000 for the completion of a trestle and bins at N Street NE., between First and Second Streets, and this is simply a continuation of that work and sufficient to carry out the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 24, after line 13, insert the following:

"GASOLINE TAX ROAD AND STREET FUND"

"For paving, repaving, grading, and otherwise improving streets, avenues, suburban roads and suburban streets, respectively, including personal services and the maintenance of motor vehicles used in this work as follows, to be paid from the special fund created by section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved April 23, 1924:

"Northwest and Southwest: For paving Fourteenth Street, B Street south to C Street north, 50 and 70 feet wide, \$30,000;

"Southeast: For paving Eleventh Street, Pennsylvania Avenue to the Anacostia Bridge, present width, \$75,000;

"Northwest: For paving Twentieth Street, E Street to Virginia Avenue, 32 feet wide, \$10,000;

"Northeast: For paving Central Avenue, Benning Road to District line, \$78,000;

"Northeast: For paving Fifteenth Street, B Street to E Street, 32 feet wide, \$38,000;

"Southeast: For paving Fifteenth Street, B Street to E Street, 32 feet wide, \$38,000;

"Northwest: For paving Butternut Street, Fifth Street to Blair Road, 45 feet wide, \$10,000;

"Northwest: For paving Forty-first Street, Davenport Street to Livingston Street, 30 feet wide, \$49,000;

"Northwest: For paving Georgia Avenue, Military Road to Fern Street, 60 feet wide, \$112,000;

"Southeast: For paving Nichols Avenue, Portland Street to Fourth Street, 56 feet wide, \$25,000;

"Northeast: For paving Bladensburg Road, end of concrete to District line, 45 and 60 feet wide, \$55,000;

"Northwest: For paving Wisconsin Avenue, Massachusetts Avenue to River Road, 60 feet wide, including necessary relocation of street car tracks and water mains, 60 feet wide, refund to be obtained from the street railway company so far as provided under existing law, \$350,000;

"Southeast: For repairing and reflooring the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, \$20,000;

* In all, \$890,000; to be disbursed and accounted for as 'gasoline tax road and street improvements,' and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be used for the improvement of any street or section thereof not herein specified: *Provided further*, That hereafter any moneys derived from assessments against private property for paving and resurfacing streets under provisions of existing law arising from the expenditure of the fund created by such act of April 23, 1924, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and be credited to and shall constitute a part of said fund and shall thereafter be available for appropriation in the same manner as the proceeds of the gasoline tax."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the following language in the amendment, which is clearly legislation and subject to a point of order:

Provided further, That hereafter any moneys derived from assessments against private property for paving and resurfacing streets under provisions of the existing law arising from the expenditure of the fund created by such act of April 23, 1924, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and be credited to, and shall constitute a part of said fund and shall thereafter be available for appropriation in the same manner as the proceeds of the gasoline tax.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I admit that language is subject to the point of order. I reoffer the amendment without that language.

Mr. BLANTON. It will not be necessary to reoffer it without the language, because that is all I make the point of order to, and the amendment stands with that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope before we dispose of it that the gentleman will modify his position. Explaining the amendment, recently we passed "an act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," which was approved April 23, 1924. When that gas tax bill was pending in the House I offered an amendment which suffered some change in the course of the legislative history of the bill, but which finally stands out as follows in the law:

The proceeds of the tax, except as provided in section 10, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States entirely to the credit of the District of Columbia, and shall be available for appropriation by the Congress exclusively for road and street improvement and repairs.

That means that the proceeds of the gas tax, the 2 cents a gallon paid by the automobile owners and truck drivers, shall be paid into the Treasury entirely to the credit of the District of Columbia, to be available exclusively for street and road improvement and repairs. Since that became a law the people of the District, who are always expecting the worst, have been sure that the worst that could be imagined has happened.

The amendment I have offered now is an attempt on my part, which I thought incumbent upon me to make as the author of that provision in the law, to keep faith with the people of the District. The motorist who pays 2 cents a gallon into this tax fund is assured that the money will be used for street and road improvement and repair. The District of Columbia bill which is now before us was made up some time ago. I understand it was completed in its terms several weeks before it was reported to the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Nearly two months.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Minnesota says two months, and it was not reported to the House sooner than it was because of pressure of other business. Therefore, the bill as reported to the House carries the program for street and

road improvement and repair which it would ordinarily carry if there had been no gas tax. As there has now been enacted this gas tax law, the tax to be paid by the people of the District and the tourists of the country and visitors to Washington, I am now offering the amendment to provide a program of additional street and road repair for the next fiscal year, to be taken from that fund. The estimates are that that fund will amount to about \$900,000 a year. There is, of course, an element of speculation in that. The commissioners have their opinion that it will not vary \$100,000 either way from that figure. The law will become effective May 23, 1924, in respect to the payment of the 2-cent tax, so that there will probably be available by the next fiscal year, 1925, a little better than 13 months' tax, or a little better than \$980,000 under that estimate.

As it is my desire to see this work out in a manner perfectly fair, in a way which will keep faith, I took the matter up with the officials of the District several days ago. I remember one year ago when we were making up the appropriations for street improvements our committee gave emphasis, and I think the committee has this year, and I think the officials in making their estimates have given emphasis to the need of adjacent property owners who were entitled to have paving in front of their several residences, where the property was 100 per cent built up, but in connection with this expenditure where it is contributed by those who drive automobiles and trucks, and so forth, it has seemed to me that a different policy should be followed.

We should endeavor to give first consideration when we are improving streets out of the gasoline tax to those arteries of travel which will be most commonly used by automobiles. The authorities of the District are in agreement with me as to that theory. I asked the authorities of the District, Major Bell, Mr. Hunt, and so forth, to prepare a program that they thought would be the most beneficial in the improving of the main arteries and streets that would be of general convenience to motorists, and the program that I have offered substantially is the one suggested by the engineer's office. There are two or three items which have seemed to me of importance that I have suggested be added to Major Bell's list, and those suggestions have been heartily concurred in by the engineer's office—for instance, the resurfacing of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge across the Anacostia River, and also the extension of the proposed repaving of Eleventh Street SE. so that it would go entirely from Pennsylvania Avenue to the bridge; also the paving of Fifteenth Street SE. from B to E. This program that I have suggested touches most of the main arteries leading out of the city. It proposes the improvement of Fourteenth Street, leading to the Highway Bridge; also of Wisconsin Avenue, that very important artery leading out into Maryland and the National Pike. It provides something for the improvement of Georgia Avenue.

It completes the cementing of Bladensburg Road. It provides for the paving of Central Avenue to connect up with the paved highway in Maryland at Capitol Heights. It provides for the improvement of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, the completion of Fifteenth Street from Fifteenth and H Streets NE. to Pennsylvania Avenue SE., and also the improvement of Eleventh Street, leading to the Anacostia Bridge. I want to say that when the program was completed I asked Colonel Keller and Mr. Hunt, in charge of the highway improvement, and Mr. Kennedy, representing the Budget, whether in their judgment that was the best program that could be made to expend this gas-tax money for the general benefit of those who pay the tax, and they have all agreed that in their opinion it does represent the best arrangement that could be made. The chairman of the committee, Mr. DAVIS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. AYRES, with whom I have consulted, have cordially supported the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will offer that part of the proposition that went out on the point of order, and ask the gentleman from Texas to withhold the point of order if he feels that he must make one.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman withhold it while I make a statement?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to state this to the gentleman as the reason why I do it.

Mr. CRAMTON. In a moment, I offer that as a proviso to be added to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: After the word "specified" in the last line of the amendment just adopted insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That hereafter any moneys derived from assessments against private property for paving and resurfacing the streets under provisions of existing law arising from the expenditure of the funds created by such acts of April 23, 1924, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and be credited to and shall constitute a part of said funds and shall thereafter be available for appropriation in the same manner as the proceeds of the gasoline tax."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, and I want to state this to the gentleman from Michigan. The only reason I make this point of order is this: Ninety per cent of all the streets in old Washington have been paved before the Borland amendment was passed, when the District paid one-half of all of it and the Government of the United States paid the other half of all of it, and the property owners did not pay a cent of it. Ninety per cent of such streets have been thus paved before the Borland Act passed in 1914 and became operative in 1915. Now, the taxpayers of the Government have already paid into this District \$215,456,000 for civic expenses, and it is only right that this little bagatelle should go back into the National Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will listen to me for a moment, I hope I can affect his judgment on this, because it is very imperative to keep full faith.

Mr. BLANTON. I am willing to withhold the point of order, only I want to have it understood that this is Saturday afternoon and the employees here have got to do their Sunday marketing, and they should be given time to do their Sunday marketing. I see present over there our genial friend from Massachusetts, whom we have missed every minute since he left us, who was one of the strongest legislators in the whole United States [applause], and he used to insist from a humanitarian standpoint that the employees of this Capitol should have Saturday afternoon in order to market. I wish he were back here, for he would make you committeemen stand around.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is referring to Judge Walsh?

Mr. BLANTON. To Judge Joe Walsh of Massachusetts, of course.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, here is the way this thing works, and I want the attention of the gentleman from Texas because I want him to withdraw the point of order. This appropriation provides the entire expense of the pavings in question, and the abutting property owners will eventually, in the next three years, pay back a portion of the expenses. Now, all of this \$890,000 will come out of the 2-cent gasoline tax. Every penny of it. The gentleman from Texas as a conferee, and I, as a Member on this floor, have done what we could to provide this fund, and he and I have been responsible in assuring the motorists that if they paid that 2 cents every cent of it would go into street improvement. Now, the effect of my amendment is this: If in the first instance we spend \$10,000 on a street and in the next three years \$4,000 comes back out of that \$10,000 it goes into the Treasury, part to the credit of the District and 40 per cent to the credit of the United States. My amendment would provide when it came back, having come from the motorists, having come from the gas-tax fund, when it came back it should go to the gas-tax fund and be used hereafter just as the law provides that fund shall be used. Now, if the gentleman's point of order is insisted upon and Congress does not legislate, a little matter like this is apt to be lost sight of. Then, when the money comes back next year it goes into the general fund, 40 per cent goes to the Federal Government—

Mr. BLANTON. It ought to.

Mr. CRAMTON. It ought not. Whenever we get ready to require the District to pay back anything we think they owe us, if we ever do, let us take it out of the people of the District and not penalize those who contribute to this special fund which the gentleman from Texas and I have both pledged ourselves shall be kept inviolate for street and road improvement.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what we are doing with the gentleman's amendment—we are spending it all upon the streets.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; we are not.

Mr. BLANTON. We are spending all the money upon the streets.

Mr. CRAMTON. And 40 per cent of it will, inside of three years, come back; and unless my amendment is adopted it will go into the Treasury, to be used by the District and by the Federal Government for anything.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman from Michigan how he will stop it. If, when he goes into conference—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will not be a conferee—

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman can get the conferees to put a provision in here to the effect that the taxpayers shall pay \$2.50 on the hundred, he will solve the problem for all time.

Mr. CRAMTON. We want to be fair. I do not want the time to come when I shall not keep my plighted word to the people of the District.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not make any pledge.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman was a conferee.

Mr. BLANTON. On the bill that the people of the District went to the White House and tried to get a veto on; yes. I did not make any pledge except the pledge I am going to fight here until the people of the District of Columbia pay a tax of \$2.50 a hundred, and I am going to keep that fight up as long as I am in Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. I appeal to the gentleman not to make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BRIDGES

For construction and repair of bridges, including an allowance at the rate of \$26 per month to the overseer of bridges for the maintenance of an automobile for use in performance of his official duties, and including maintenance of motor vehicles, \$80,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make a point of order on the whole paragraph. I just make it to that part that is subject to a point of order. I make it on the word "construction" in line 15, which would cut out new construction, which requires legislation, and which is unauthorized by law. It has come from no legislative committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, that word "construction" has been carried in there for many years. I do not see any particular harm in leaving it in there now. It is construction and repair of bridges. I do not think there is anything wrong in it, or anything that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will make the suggestion to the Chair that a bridge is simply a part of a street improvement. When you proceed with your paving, when you come to the stream or otherwise where a bridge or culvert is necessary, the construction of that is simply in continuation of a work in progress.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is not necessary that we shall have to legislate to complete this \$14,600,000 memorial bridge across the Potomac.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will be necessary to get an appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. You can not build it out of this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dalzell], on May 4, 1900, made a ruling that is in point here. I read from Rinds' Precedents, Volume IV, section 3794:

On May 4, 1900, the sundry civil appropriation bill being under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, this paragraph was read:

"For construction of a bridge across Rock Creek on the line of the roadway from Quarry Road entrance under the direction of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, \$22,000, one-half of which sum shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. J. H. Bankhead, of Alabama, having made a point of order, the Chairman held:

"The Chair has no doubt that this appropriation is in continuance of a public work already begun and is not subject to a point of order."

With this the Chair concurs, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as a new Member of this House, I had not been here but a few weeks until I became convinced that there was something radically wrong in the system under which the District of Columbia is governed. Subsequent investigation has confirmed this opinion. The length of time consumed by Congress in District of Columbia legislation is out of all proportion to the time consumed in legislating for the rest of the United States. Under the rules of this House, two Mondays in each month are de-

voted to District legislation; that is, 2 days out of every 24 must be spent by Congress in District of Columbia legislation, and the other legislative days are reserved for general legislation. Two days to legislate for one-half million people and 24 days to legislate for the remaining 109,500,000 people in the United States.

I am not criticizing Congress for this legislation, but I am criticizing a system that requires so much of the time of Congress in legislating for the District of Columbia. We are spending practically one-twelfth of the entire session in legislation involving an infinity of detail with reference to the District of Columbia, while the major things involving the prosperity and economic life of the Nation are pushed aside.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LOZIER. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. And at the rate we are going, we shall probably spend one-twelfth more.

Mr. LOZIER. This is probably true. The Members of this House must realize that this policy was never contemplated when the District of Columbia was selected as our seat of government. And if the fathers of this Republic, who voted to establish the Capital at the falls of the Potomac, instead of at the falls of the Delaware, could see the trouble and perplexity which surround Congress now over the legislation with reference to the District of Columbia, they would wonder whether or not they were wise in coming out to what was then almost a wilderness for a site for our National Capital.

The founders of our Government encountered serious difficulties in deciding on a location for our Capital.

The Continental Congress met in different cities, having had an ambulatory experience. It assembled on 10 occasions at 8 different places—Philadelphia, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Lancaster, York, Philadelphia, Princeton, Annapolis, Trenton, and New York. The first five meetings were during the Revolutionary War. On June 21, 1783, a mob interrupted the session of the Congress in Philadelphia. This mob was composed largely of militiamen who were demanding payment for their services. The Members were not permitted to speak, and loaded muskets were drawn on the Members. As a result Congress decided to erect a building near the falls of the Delaware river (Trenton). This plan was opposed by the southern Members of the Continental Congress, who demanded that another meeting place should be provided near the falls of the Potomac and that Congress should meet first at one of these places, and then at the other. The New Jersey proposition was adopted, but as the Government had no money to build a Capitol it was decided that Congress should meet in New York City until the new Capitol was ready for occupancy.

There was widespread opposition to Congress meeting in New York City, where it was claimed the Members would be under the sinister and corrupting influence of the "money power." The proposal to select Philadelphia as the permanent Capital was objected to because the Quakers favored the abolition of slavery, which indicates that even at that early day the slavery question was becoming a factor in public affairs.

The first Congress after the adoption of our Federal Constitution seriously contemplated establishing the Capital of the Nation on the banks of the Susquehanna. To Thomas Jefferson is ascribed the credit of having defeated this carefully prepared plan. He desired to locate the Capital of the Nation on the Potomac, midway between the South and North and far from the then centers of wealth and population, to the end that Congress and the National Government might at all times be free and far removed from the "corrupting influences" of the money power and commercial classes, who were then beginning to exercise a potential influence in public affairs.

Mr. Jefferson gave a dinner to which a large number of Members of Congress were invited. Among the guests were two very aggressive anti-Federalists who were opposing the assumption of the State debt by the Federal Government. As a result of "logrolling," these two anti-Federalists withdrew their opposition to the Federal Government assuming the debts of the States on condition that the Federalists vote to establish the Capital on the banks of the Potomac after 10 years, during which time the Capital was to remain at Philadelphia. The Federalists were very anxious to have the General Government assume the debts of the several States, and in order to secure the adoption of this policy a sufficient number of the Federalists voted with the southern Members to insure the location of the Capital on the Potomac.

The act of Congress of June 28, 1790, established the Capital "at some place between the mouths of the Eastern Branch and the Connogocheague." The District was laid out by General Washington. It may be of interest to note that it included the site of the ancient village of Powhatan.

A man named Pope had at one time owned and occupied this land as a plantation. Strange as it may seem, he must have dreamed that at some time the Capitol of the Nation would be located here, for in his will he called this hill "the Capitol" and a brook nearby "the Tiber."

When the Capital was established here it was far removed, as distance was then computed, from the great centers of wealth and population. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and other constitutional fathers contributed materially to the upbuilding of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington. After the burning by the British Army, Congress decided to remove the Capital to some northern locality. The Speaker cast the deciding vote on this proposal, but the plan was abandoned and the Capitol of our Nation remained on the site where the founders of our Republic established it.

The District of Columbia was governed by three commissioners appointed by the President until 1871, at which time, in response to a general demand from the people of the District, it was given a governor, legislature, and a Delegate in Congress. After three years of self-government the District was bankrupt. During this period graft and corruption permeated every branch of the District government, and it was necessary for Congress to again assume direct legislative control over the affairs of the District.

By the act of June, 1878, the present comprehensive scheme of government was adopted. This bill has been referred to by our Supreme Court as "the Constitution of the District of Columbia." Up to 1874, all of the expenses of the District were paid by the people of the District. For a time thereafter these expenses were divided equally between the District and the Federal Government. Later on these expenses were apportioned on a 60-40 basis.

Now, we shall have in the city of Washington within less than a quarter of a century, 1,000,000 people; and the complications which now confront the Congress will be multiplied over and over again. When the people of the District of Columbia want anything they come before Congress and say, "We are the wards of the Government. The United States is the wet nurse of this municipality, and you must open the Treasury of the United States and make appropriations for the maintenance of the District." The contention as to how the expense of the District shall be apportioned waxes warmer at each session of Congress.

Now, some method must be devised within the next few years by which Congress and the people of the United States will be relieved from the necessity of legislating in matters involving an infinity of details, with reference to the municipal and local matters of the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that ultimately we shall be forced, in self-defense, to cede back to the State of Maryland this District territory, the United States Government retaining jurisdiction and sovereignty over its buildings and grounds, with such additional sovereignty and jurisdiction as may be found necessary to enable the Federal Government to efficiently and effectively function. If that is done, the District will become a part of the State of Maryland, with all the civil and political rights of the present citizens of Maryland. Then the people of the District will have representation in Congress. They will have the right to vote for President and Vice President. They will not be disfranchised as they now claim to be, and yet at the same time they will be subject to State laws and enjoy the municipal powers now exercised by the citizens of Maryland. This done, they will not be clamoring at the doors of Congress each year for appropriations, and the time of Congress can be given to the enactment of legislation in which the people of the entire United States have an interest.

I have not formulated a definite plan, but I am making this suggestion hoping that before the assembling of the second session of the Sixty-eighth Congress the leaders in the House—the men who are familiar with District affairs, the men who have studied these problems and know the needs and difficulties of the people of the District—will get together and formulate a plan which will permanently solve this complicated problem of District of Columbia government.

We have been quibbling and engaging in child's play so far as legislation for the District is concerned, and there will always be trouble and contention until we have adopted a system by which Congress will be relieved of the necessity at every session of Congress of devoting a considerable part of its time in legislating for the District.

No other nation has "a District of Columbia problem." Other nations efficiently function with their seat of government in cities which are not under national control.

I am suggesting no definite plan. I am committed to no particular policy, but I do say that a change in the system for

the government of the city of Washington and the District of Columbia is inevitable. This is a big question, and Congress might as well begin in earnest to consider its proper solution.

It is out of the question to talk about giving the District self-government in the sense of according it representation in the House, Senate, and Electoral College, but I do favor some system which will, in so far as possible, give the District self-government, with the burdens and benefits incident thereto; and it may be necessary to relinquish the District territory to the State of Maryland, the Federal Government retaining jurisdiction and sovereignty over its buildings and grounds and all such additional sovereignty and jurisdiction as may be necessary to enable the Government to efficiently and effectively function. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] complains because Congress, as he says, devotes about one-fifth of its time to District legislation, but there is not one-fifth of the Members of Congress who do that at all. Until some few extra Members came in a few minutes ago, I counted at one time to-day only 15 Members on the floor who were devoting their time to District affairs.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman from Missouri has been here all day.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will count, he will see that not over 30 or 35 Members devote very much time to District business at any time when this bill is up, so that when bills affecting the District of Columbia come up it is natural for those of us who have studied District business to take the floor. We have made a study of them during many days and sometimes during a part of the night, so gentlemen should not complain when we do have to take the floor.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I just want to say that I agree entirely with the gentleman that when we are discussing District affairs, which are of so much importance to the general taxpayers as well as to Washington itself, there should be more Members here. I would like to say at the same time that the gentleman's [Mr. LOZIER] suggestion that the District of Columbia be returned to its mother State of Maryland is one which interests me very greatly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations hereafter made for the construction and repair of bridges shall be available for repairing, when necessary, any bridge carrying a public street over the right of way of property of any railway company, or for constructing, reconstructing, or repairing in such manner as shall in the judgment of the commissioners be necessary reasonably to accommodate public traffic, any bridge required to carry or carrying such traffic in a public street over the right of way or property of any canal company operating as such in the District of Columbia, on the neglect or refusal of such railway or canal company to do such work when notified and required by the commissioners, and the amounts thus expended shall be a valid and subsisting lien against the property of such railway company or of such canal company, and shall be collected from such railway company or from such canal company in the manner provided in section 5 of an act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Government, approved June 11, 1878, and shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in the same proportions as the appropriations for such purposes have been or may be paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I will say that this amendment is the same amendment that I previously offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 25, line 15, after the words "in the" strike out "same proportions as the appropriations for such purposes have been may be paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "proportions required by law."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that it does not change the law.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question. We have several bridges across rivers here, the Anacostia and the Potomac Rivers, over which street railway companies run their cars. The law requires these car companies to pay a toll. They have gotten the benefit of the bridges which have been built at Government expense, yet I understand these street railway companies refuse to pay that toll and it is not being collected. I want to know why the committee does not take steps to make them pay for the privilege of crossing bridges which they themselves would have to furnish if they were not constructed otherwise.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Let the District legislative committee, of which the gentleman is a member, enact some law which will force them to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. The law is already here requiring them to do it, but they are not doing it. I imagine that if this committee were to withhold the salaries of the individuals whose duty it is to make them pay that toll they would begin making them pay it at once. I want to suggest that to the committee, that it withhold those salaries if they do not begin collecting those tolls in full and make them pay. Why should we furnish this big, fine \$3,000,000 Francis Scott Key Bridge across the Potomac and let the railroad companies cross it, when they would have had to build it themselves if they were not given the privilege of crossing it? We had to make it wide enough to carry their tracks, and they ought to pay the full amount of the toll required by law or they ought not to be permitted to cross it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This would be a fruitful subject for investigation, would it not?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, investigations! I am sick of them; when they cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and accomplish nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Francis Scott Key Bridge across Potomac River: For miscellaneous supplies and expenses of every kind necessarily incident to the maintenance of the bridge and approaches, including personal services, \$2,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: After the word "Bridge" in line 4, page 26, strike out the words "across Potomac River."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: On page 26, line 4, after the word "Bridge," strike out the words "across Potomac River."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEWERS

For cleaning and repairing sewers and basins, including the purchase of two motor field wagons at not to exceed \$650 each, the purchase of two motor trucks at not to exceed \$650 each, and the purchase of one motor tractor at not to exceed \$650; for operation and maintenance of the sewage pumping service, including repairs to boilers, machinery, and pumping stations, and employment of mechanics and laborers, purchase of coal, oils, waste, and other supplies, and for the maintenance of motor vehicles used in this work, \$231,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the following language on page 26, lines 22 and 23, which reads as follows: "and the purchase of one motor tractor at not to exceed \$650," being legislation, unauthorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to be considered discourteous, but thinks the Chair has indicated his opinion on this matter. The point is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman. On page 3, line 27, after the figures "\$231,000," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following language:

Provided, That no part of this sum shall become available until regulations shall prescribe that parties connecting with such sewer system shall bear the full expense of all such connections, including necessary excavation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 27, line 3, after the figures "\$231,000," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That no part of this sum shall become available until regulations shall prescribe that parties connecting with such sewer system shall bear the full expense of all such connections, including excavation."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. On the ground it is legislation and not a limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it is a limitation, pure and simple. I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The language itself, as the Chair well knows, must show a limitation on the expenditure.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, here is the situation, I will state for the benefit of the committee, that ought to be interested in this just as much as I am. At present, just to illustrate the matter and show you that it does retrench, here is a 20-foot lot that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] may own. He builds a residence on it and wants to connect with this Government sewer system. He does not make the connection. He applies to the District government down here at the Municipal Building. They send their plumbers up there and their dirt diggers and make all that excavation themselves out into the street, sometimes costing \$200 or \$300, if you please; they lay all the pipes, they make all the plumbing connections, sometimes costing quite a large sum, and for all of that they charge the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] only \$30, or \$1.50 a front foot for the 20 feet, in a flat-rate charge. That is the total charge for making such a connection.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. I just want a little information. I just asked the chairman of the committee about this matter. I may have misunderstood the gentleman. If they are running a sewer down a street, that, of course, the city and the Federal Government pays for?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Now, do you mean to say that if I own a lot and want to tap the main sewer the city pays the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and you pay just \$30 for a 20-foot lot.

Mr. BEGG. The chairman of the committee says otherwise.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman does not know. I have been down to the District Building myself and have found out. I have Auditor Donovan's statement in writing over his signature that that is the case—a man with a 20-foot front lot pays \$1.50 a front foot, which would be \$30.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is for the main sewer laid in the street.

Mr. BLANTON. That is for connecting the premises with that sewer to obtain service.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Where the property owner wants to connect with that sewer in order to connect it with his house he pays all the expense.

Mr. BLANTON. I have Auditor Donovan's statement to the effect that the property owner does not, but pays just \$30 where it is a lot 20-foot front.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman read his statement?

Mr. BLANTON. I have not the letter here. It is in my office. I have called attention to this a dozen times here on the floor.

Mr. BEGG. I think the gentleman is wrong, and the chairman of the committee says he is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. That just shows how little some of our friends know about the District business. Let me tell you also about the water system. When the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] have their 20-foot lots here, if they want to connect with the water system to get the water to their private family residence, with a 20-foot lot they pay \$2 a front foot, which is only \$40. The District and Government pay all the balance.

Mr. BEGG. What is the \$2 for?

Mr. BLANTON. It is just a straight, flat-rate charge, a lump-sum charge of \$2 per front foot.

Mr. BEGG. What for?

Mr. BLANTON. It is a bagatelle of an excuse for getting a connection and having the District and Government pay for it. That is the kind of benefits these people living here have been getting for 25 or 30 years.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Two dollars a front foot is all they pay for getting that water connection.

Mr. BEGG. Wait until I ask the question, please. Does the city pay for the water pipe or the sewer pipe or whatever it is that is used?

Mr. BLANTON. The city and the Government pay all of it, except the \$1.50 and the \$2 per front foot for making the respective connections.

Mr. BEGG. For piping it into the house, I suppose?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. And pay for the plumbing, too?

Mr. BLANTON. All of it and the excavation, and charges \$1.50 per front foot for sewer and \$2 per front foot for water connection.

Mr. BEGG. That is so ridiculous—

Mr. BLANTON. I know it sounds ridiculous, and it is ridiculous, and that is the reason I am calling attention to it. It is something that has been going on here that ought to be stopped. This is the reason the people here in the District kick when you try to make them pay more taxes. They have been getting these things almost free for years.

Mr. BEGG. Now, will the gentleman cool down and not get so excited and listen to my question until I am through so he will know what I am asking?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to send over and get Auditor Donovan's letter and ask permission to put it in the RECORD to-night.

Mr. BEGG. Let us pass this particular paragraph until you get that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, Mr. Donovan's letter showing that these very conditions exist here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks—

Mr. BLANTON. All I want is to put in the RECORD Mr. Donovan's letter if I can find it in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, if the point of order leads to any particular discussion, I am willing to withdraw it, but without prejudice.

LETTER FROM AUDITOR DONOVAN

The following is the letter referred to as received from Auditor Donovan:

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 25, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: In response to your request of several days ago I take pleasure in furnishing you the information you desire.

Prior to the passage of the Borland amendment property owners were subject to an assessment for sidewalks, alleys, and curbs to the extent of one-half of the total cost. This is also the law at the present time. Property of the United States and the District of Columbia is not subject to assessment for special improvements. Roadway improvements were first charged against property owners by the terms of the Borland law. Service sewers and water mains were and are now also charged in part against abutting property.

The half cost of roadway pavement immediately abutting the frontage of assessable property, excluding street intersections between building lines of the intersecting streets and excluding any pavement area beyond a line 20 feet abutting the property, is assessed as a special improvement tax against such property. The cost of any pavement area in excess of 40 feet is borne by the United States and the District of Columbia in the proportion that each is charged with the appropriation. On streets where there are street railway tracks the railway companies are chargeable under the law with the whole cost of paving between the tracks and 2 feet exterior to the outer rail of the tracks. The property of the United States and the District of Columbia is not subject to assessment under the Borland law.

For service sewers the law at present provides for a flat rate assessment of \$1.50 per front foot, with certain deductions made for corner property. This rate represents approximately 37 per cent of the cost of the work.

The special assessments received for the several forms of improvements indicated are paid into the Treasury of the United States, 60 per cent to the credit of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent to the credit of the United States, this being the proportion that each bears of the appropriations for the improvements.

For water mains the law provides a special assessment of \$2 per front foot, and this amount represents approximately 66 per cent of

the cost of the work. Water-main assessments when received are paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the water-department fund.

At the time of the passage of the Borland law approximately 90 per cent of the streets within the limits of the old city of Washington were already paved, and many of the streets outside of those limits also were paved. I am unable at this time to give you an idea of the proportion of the streets outside of the original city of Washington that were paved when the Borland law was passed.

Not only new paving, but the resurfacing and replacing of pavements is chargeable against abutting property under the Borland law.

The Knox case in the court of appeals involved the question of the application of the Borland law to outlying sections of the District of Columbia and to the particular matter of paving Naylor Road, near the eastern boundary of the District of Columbia. The Knox property was agricultural property. There were no settlements in the immediate vicinity. There were no sewers, water mains, electric or gas lights, curbs, sidewalks, or building lines, and no other conditions which might be called town or village conditions. The court of appeals held in that case that because of the language of the law Congress intended it to apply to those settlements or sections which exhibited town or village conditions, and that the law did not apply to situations like those presented in the Knox case. The assessments were therefore ordered to be canceled. Similar cases are now pending in the courts in regard to other localities, which are claimed to present conditions that existed in the Knox case.

The following appropriations were made by Congress for repair and maintenance of streets during the fiscal years 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924, each of such appropriations being charged 60 per cent against the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent against the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year 1921	\$575,000
Fiscal year 1922	575,000
Fiscal year 1923	460,000
Fiscal year 1924	550,000
Total	2,160,000

The following appropriations covering the same period have been made for repairs to suburban streets and roads, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year 1921	\$250,000
Fiscal year 1922	250,000
Fiscal year 1923	225,000
Fiscal year 1924	275,000
Total	1,000,000

The following appropriations have been made for the same period for street improvements, including the paving and grading of streets, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year 1921	\$614,200
Fiscal year 1922	144,840
Fiscal year 1923	233,500
Fiscal year 1924	573,300
Total	1,565,000

The following appropriations have been made for construction and maintenance of sewers for the fiscal years 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year 1921	\$515,000
Fiscal year 1922	523,000
Fiscal year 1923	502,000
Fiscal year 1924	690,000
Total	2,231,000

I regret very much that it has not been practicable for me to furnish you with this information at an earlier date. In the event that you desire any more details regarding the several matters herein, I shall be very glad to respond to such a request from you.

Very truly yours,

D. J. DONOVAN,
Auditor, District of Columbia.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order without prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule; but if the gentleman wishes to withdraw the point of order, he can do so.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the Chair is ready to rule, I would like to have the ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule as soon as the Clerk has the amendment in form.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. While the matter is being prepared I want to say that "the gentleman from Illinois," with his 20-foot lot in the District, is altogether hypothetical. The "gentleman from Illinois" would not know what to do with a 20-foot lot if he had it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment provides that no part of this sum shall become available until regulations shall prescribe that parties connecting with such sewer system shall bear the full expense of all such connection, including the expense of excavation.

That is intended to be a limitation. Under the ordinary rules applicable to these matters a limitation is proper only when it reduces the amount, puts a proper limitation on expenditures of amount, if it does not require some affirmative act on the part of some executive officer or change existing law. If it does either of these two things, it is not a proper limitation.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Illinois made a point of order against it, but I think I can convince the Chair that it is a change of existing law and hence legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not disagree with the gentleman. It is admitted to be legislation, but it is contended that it is a limitation and therefore comes within the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. It comes within the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not stated by the gentleman from Texas; the Chair understood the gentleman to contend that it was a proper limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I contend that it retrenches expenditures, for it makes them pay, where we are now paying for it out of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. In what manner does it reduce the item to which it is offered as an amendment? The item authorizes the expenditure of \$231,000. There is nothing in the amendment making any change in the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Out of that \$200,000 will be made connections which the individual will pay for.

The CHAIRMAN. The item in the bill under consideration appropriates for cleaning and repairing sewers and basins, including the purchase of two motor field wagons, and so forth, for the operation and maintenance of the sewage pumping service, and so forth, \$231,000. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which provides that none of this sum shall be available until certain regulations have been made by the District commissioners, and the consequence of such an amendment would be that after they had made such regulations the amount of \$231,000 is available and can be used. Therefore it does not retrench expenditures.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And it is not germane; it relates to sewer-pipe extension. This does not relate to the extension of sewers, it is for the cleaning of sewers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion for several reasons that the point of order ought to be sustained, and so rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the construction of the Upper Potomac, main interceptor, \$20,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman put it in writing.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, while I am putting this in writing I ask unanimous consent to pass by the item with the privilege of returning to it after the amendment is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the item will be passed over with the privilege of returning to it when the gentleman completes his amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, dead animals, night soil, and miscellaneous refuse and ashes in the District of Columbia (no contract shall be let for the collection of dead animals), including inspection and allowance to inspectors for maintenance of horses and vehicles or motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed for each inspector \$20 per month for a horse and vehicle, \$26 per month for automobiles, and \$13 per month for motor cycles; fencing of public and private property designated by the commissioners as public dumps; and incidental expenses, \$900,000: *Provided*, That any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse or garbage shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in the same proportions as the appropriations for such purposes are paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels and places of business or from apartment houses of four or more apartments in which the landlord furnishes heat to tenants.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 6, after the word "Columbia," strike out the words "in the same proportions as the appropriations for such purposes are paid from the Treasury of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia," and insert the words "in the proportion required by law."

Mr. CRAMTON. This is the same amendment that we have been carrying through the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC PLAYGROUNDS

For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$71,270; for services of extra directors at not exceeding 35 cents per hour, \$800; for services of extra watchmen at not exceeding 25 cents per hour, \$600; in all \$72,670: *Provided*, That employments hereunder other than of persons paid by the hour shall be distributed as to duration in accordance with the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1924.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Who are the extra watchmen, what do they do, and when are they on duty?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They are on duty quite a number of months in the year. Mrs. Rhodes is the foreman of the whole thing.

Mr. BEGG. As director or watchman?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Supervisor of playgrounds.

Mr. BEGG. What is a watchman of playgrounds?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. There is a watchman and a director as to how it shall be done. The watchman stays there an hour, sometimes two, and sometimes not more than 10 minutes. He is there to see that there is nothing going wrong on the playgrounds.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I understand the purpose of the director, but I do not understand the need for a watchman on the playgrounds. What is he watching for?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not tell the gentleman, except to say that after the playgrounds are shut up he watches to see that nobody goes there and interferes with them. The gentleman knows that the playgrounds have swings and things of that sort. That is what the watchman is for.

Mr. BEGG. He goes on duty when the director goes off?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for playgrounds, \$151,270; of which \$144,270 shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be expended, for the purchase of land for playground purposes, shall be paid 40 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States and 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 20, after the figures "\$151,270," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simply to carry out the change made in the fiscal relations. Of course, if the amendment to section 1 is continued, it will not be necessary to continue that any more.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. No newspaper in Washington ought ever hereafter to condemn the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] for any amendment that he might offer to a bill as unfriendly to the District. The amendment that he has had put on this bill is not unfriendly to the District. It requires this Government to pay \$8,000,000 a year. We paid over \$400,000 for that playground out there opposite Mrs. Henderson's on Sixteenth Street—100 per cent out of the Treasury—and we have paid over \$150,000 since to put that wall there and improve it. And for other playgrounds which have been bought and paid for partly by the Government we have spent huge sums.

The law now is that a playground shall be paid for wholly out of the District revenues, and this bill is merely providing for the present law, with the exception of \$7,000. It provides that the \$144,270 shall be taken wholly out of the revenues of the District, but the Cramton amendment would change it. That is in accordance with the present law, but it is fudging over the present law by providing that \$7,000 shall be under

this pro rata plan. The gentleman from Michigan wants to change that law. He seems to want to go back to the old law, having the Government continue to buy the playgrounds for the 70,000 children of the city of Washington. That is not right. I do not know why he has changed front on this situation so suddenly, unless possibly he does not understand the fact that that law exists. He may be squirming under this criticism that has lately been made of him. I did not think that my friend from Michigan would squirm, when he has made so many good fights for prohibition and had the wets attack him all over the country. He ought to be impervious to these attacks by newspapers by this time. I do not think it is right for this little handful of Members to change that law, although I did not want to make the point of order against it. People may as well find out where we stand on this proposition. If you are going to have the taxpayers of this Government pay even for the playgrounds for the children of the city of Washington, the taxpayers ought to know it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have never believed until to-day that one Member of the House could contribute so much misinformation as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has succeeded in doing to-day. As a matter of fact, the amendment which I offered, the \$8,000,000 proposition, provides that everything above that shall be paid by the District, and if that becomes a law that will include this \$144,270, which is consuming the gentleman's soul in anguish. If I did not offer the amendment to strike out this language, the \$7,000 would be still a charge in part upon the Treasury in addition to the \$8,000,000, and the first part of it would be entirely unnecessary, and hence the amendment that I have offered.

The gentleman thinks that the \$8,000,000 would not accomplish anything for the protection of the Federal Treasury. I am not desirous of greatly reducing the Federal contribution, but the estimates that went to the Budget this year, if they had been approved by the Budget, would have cost the Treasury \$13,000,000 instead of \$8,000,000. Those expenditures and those improvements ought to be made, and I am providing a way by which those expenditures and improvements can be made without increasing the \$8,000,000 of expenditure from the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, at this point I offer the amendment which the committee granted me leave to offer a few minutes ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 27, line 19, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"That no part of any appropriation made under this head, sewers, shall be paid in, covering the expenses incident to a private-property owner having his residence or business property connected up with said sewer system, in order to obtain service, but that all of such expenses shall be paid by said private-property owner."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not in the proper place. This has nothing to do with continuing the construction of the Upper Potomac main interceptor, which is the paragraph immediately preceding it.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Illinois does not want the people to pay their share of sewer connections, it is all right with me.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am willing that the people of the District shall pay their share of the expenses of this Government, but I want it done in a regular and orderly way. I think that a proposition of this sort should be considered by the proper committee.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a limitation pure and simple, and it retrenches expenditures.

Mr. CRAMTON. It may interest the gentleman from Texas to know that a Member of the House just called the auditor's office and he finds that the gentleman from Texas is in error.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the situation?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not talked with him.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman who has talked with him state it?

Mr. CRAMTON. He seems to have stepped out.

Mr. BLANTON. I have the auditor's letter in black and white.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The auditor denies the statement the gentleman made a few minutes ago.

Mr. BLANTON. He can not deny his own signature.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The law absolutely denies it, too.

Mr. BLANTON. We will see when I get the auditor's letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the first part of this amendment is in order as a limitation and that the latter part of it is faulty. The Chair will read the amendment:

That no part of any appropriation made under this head, sewers, shall be paid in covering the expenses incident to a private property owner having his residence or business property connected up with said sewer system in order to obtain service.

Now, that plainly is a limitation. But this following language is not—

But that all of such expenses shall be paid by said private property owner.

That is legislation, and the point of order being made on the whole amendment it must be sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment with the other part stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 27, line 19, insert a new paragraph:

"That no part of any appropriation made under this head 'sewers' shall be paid in covering the expenses incident to a private property owner having his residence or business property connected up with this sewer system in order to obtain service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment. The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were ayes 3, noes 13.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For alterations in police-patrol signal system in the second, eighth, and tenth police precincts, rearrangement of circuits and reconnection of certain boxes because of changes in boundaries of those precincts incident to establishment of the new twelfth police precinct, including the purchase and installation of necessary poles, cross arms, insulators, pins, braces, wire, cable, conduit connections, posts, instruments, extra labor, and other necessary items, to be immediately available, \$3,120.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, it is Saturday evening and 4 o'clock, and I think we need a new shift, and I make the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it; we have an understanding—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move a call of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Three gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number; and the committee refuses to rise.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. AYRES. I withdraw my request.

Mr. BEGG. Can not we come to some amicable agreement?

Mr. AYRES. We can; we can go ahead with this bill without killing so much time. We have been on this bill for the last four days and have gotten through 26 pages, and for one I want it understood we are going to proceed with it, and if I could have my way we would stay here until 11 o'clock at night.

Mr. BEGG. Some of us are trying to help the gentleman. Mr. AYRES. I appreciate the fact that some are and also that some are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that vote.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no division on the question of tellers. Tellers were demanded, and not a sufficient number arose.

Mr. BEGG. On the motion that the committee rise I ask for a division.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the point of order that the roll call has commenced.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee voted; some gentleman asked for tellers and only three gentlemen rose, not a suffi-

cient number and tellers were refused. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Fish	McClintic	Rogers, N. H.
Aldrich	Frear	McDuffie	Romjue
Anderson	Fredericks	McFadden	Rosenbloom
Anthony	Freeman	McKenzie	Rubey
Bacharach	Frothingham	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sabath
Bankhead	Funk	McNulty	Schneider
Barkley	Gallivan	McSweeney	Scott
Beck	Garber	Magee, Pa.	Sears, Fla.
Bell	Geran	Major, Ill.	Sears, Nebr.
Berger	Gifford	Manlove	Shreve
Bixler	Glatfelter	Mead	Sites
Black, N. Y.	Goldsborough	Merritt	Snyder
Bowling	Greene, Mass.	Michaelson	Sproul, Ill.
Boylan	Greenwood	Miller, Ill.	Stalker
Britten	Griest	Mills	Stengle
Browne, N. J.	Hardy	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Browne, Wis.	Harrison	Mooney	Sullivan
Brumm	Hawley	Moore, Ga.	Sweet
Buchanan	Hayden	Moore, Ill.	Swoope
Burdick	Hersey	Morgan	Tague
Butler	Hoch	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell	Holaday	Morris	Taylor, Tenn.
Carew	Hooker	Morrow	Thomas, Okla.
Carter	Howard, Nebr.	Mudd	Thompson
Casey	Howard, Okla.	Murphy	Treadway
Celler	Hull, William E.	Nelson, Wis.	Tucker
Clague	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Minn.	Tydings
Clark, Fla.	Johnson, Tex.	Nolan	Underhill
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, Wash.	O'Brien	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Jost	O'Connell, R. I.	Vaile
Corning	Kahn	Oliver, Ala.	Vare
Crisp	Kelly	Park, Ga.	Vestal
Croll	Kendall	Parker	Vinson, Ga.
Cummings	Ketcham	Peavey	Voigt
Curry	Kiess	Peery	Ward, N. C.
Davey	Kindred	Periman	Ward, N. Y.
Deal	Kunz	Phillips	Wason
Dickinson, Mo.	Kurtz	Porter	Watson
Dickstein	Langley	Pou	Weller
Dominick	Lanham	Prall	Welsh
Doyle	Larson, Minn.	Quayle	Wertz
Drane	Leatherwood	Ransley	Williamson
Drewry	Leavitt	Reece	Winslow
Eagan	Lindsay	Reed, Ark.	Winter
Edmonds	Lineberger	Reed, N. Y.	Wood
Fairchild	Linthicum	Reed, W. Va.	Wurzbach
Fairfield	Little	Reid, Ill.	Wyant
Favrot	Logan	Robinson	Yates
Fenn	Luce	Rogers, Mass.	Zihlman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8839, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called, whereupon 235 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he reported the list of absentees for entry in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. LOZIER. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Salaries: Superintendent, \$6,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$3,750 each; business manager, to be in charge of the business administration of the public-school system, and to be appointed by and responsible to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$3,750; director of intermediate instruction, 13 supervising principals, supervisor of manual training and director of primary instruction, 16 in all, at a minimum salary of \$2,400 each; in all, \$55,650.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order—

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order to the language beginning in line 16, on page 33, reading as follows:

Business manager, to be in charge of the business administration of the public-school system, and to be appointed by and responsible to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$3,750.

That is new legislation, a new position, unauthorized by law. If, however, the school bill were passed and had become a law, this would be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Texas, are the officers named in this particular paragraph statutory officers?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. This particular position is provided for in the school bill which the House passed the other day,

but it has not been reported out of the Senate committee, as I understand; or if it has been, it has been in the last day or so.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSON. Would the gentleman reserve his point of order if the position were changed so that he could be appointed by and be responsible to the Board of Education?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I will say this to the gentleman: If the school bill passes—and I understand it will pass—it is going to be necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to bring in a deficiency bill not only for the school bill but also for the police and fire bill when it becomes a law. So we might just as well provide for all of these positions after the school bill passes. There is no use in carrying this position in this bill.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I agree with the gentleman as to his point of order, but we might as well agree here.

Mr. BLANTON. These matters all have to be threshed out after the Senate passes on the school bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota agree that these are statutory provisions?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will concede that this is subject to a point of order. But it is the most important thing in this bill. Heretofore we have never had a business manager. The school business is tangled up because we have no efficient man to attend to the business management of the schools.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 33, at the end of line 22, insert: "Provided, That no part of this sum shall be available for the payment of the salaries of any superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of intermediate instruction, or supervising principal who permits the teaching of partisan politics, disrespect to the Holy Bible, or that ours is an inferior form of government."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make a point of order to that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation, and of course it is in order.

I think everyone will agree with me that no teaching of this kind should be permitted in the schools of this District nor in the public school of any city or town in any State in the Union.

I have spoken to a number of Members, and it is an exception to find one who does not say that his children have come to him with complaints in regard to one or the other of the points mentioned in this amendment.

In the interest of the highest possible standard of education in this city, and because I believe that the schools here should be as nearly as possible a model for those throughout the country, I think this thing ought to be stopped, and this amendment will have that effect.

If it should be contended that no one is guilty of permitting this, then the amendment will do no harm. If they are guilty of permitting it knowingly, then it should apply.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman information that such things are going on in the schools which his amendment is intended to reach?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Who will pass upon the question as to whether this is happening or not? Who will be the arbiter?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The school board.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will not the man who issues or pays these warrants be the one? This being a limitation on this appropriation, will they not pass this question up to the accounting officers of the Government?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. All right.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In a practical way, I would like to know how that is going to work.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It might be up to the accounting officers. Anyhow, there would be a way then by which one might file a complaint and stop the payment of salaries to anyone who has been permitting this pernicious teaching. It has unquestionably been going on for years, and is going on in this present year.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that the Board of Education can control this matter? Does the gentleman think it wise to put a limitation upon the appropriation?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes, I do; because I know of no other way to reach it. This will stop it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. An act of Congress would reach it in the regular way.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is no other way that I know of whereby we can reach it in a practical manner. In the interest of our children and of the Government itself this teaching must stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, may we have it again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Principals of junior high schools, eight at \$2,700 each; seven assistant principals, who shall be deans of girls of the Central High School, Eastern High School, Dunbar High School, Business High School, Western High School, McKinley Manual Training High School, and Armstrong Manual Training High School, at \$2,400 each: *Provided*, That said assistant principals shall be placed at a basic salary of \$2,400 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the legislation that is in this paragraph, as follows: "Seven assistant principals, who shall be deans of girls of the Central High School, Eastern High School, Dunbar High School, Business High School, Western High School, McKinley Manual Training High School, and Armstrong Manual Training High School." In that connection I will state that it is legislation unauthorized by law. If the teachers' salary bill had become a law this would be authorized, and when the teachers' salary bill finally becomes a law it is going to require that all of those salaries be taken care of in a deficiency bill, so there is no use of providing here for these new positions. In other words, there are four new assistants here provided, and the present law permits only three assistants. When the teachers' salary bill passes it will permit seven, but that bill has not yet passed the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Which of these schools are not authorized by law?

Mr. BLANTON. The following are not authorized by law, and they are the only ones I am attempting to reach: Business High School, Western High School, McKinley Manual Training High School, and Armstrong Manual Training High School. The only part I care to make a point of order against is that relating to the word "seven" when it ought to be "three" and those four high schools named above, because they are new positions that are created by the school-teachers' salary bill which is now before the Senate. There is no use of putting them in until the bill has passed the Senate and becomes law. The Senate might change the bill and restrict the number to six or less. A fight is now being made on this very item by one of the Senators who is on the Senate District Committee. We do not know what the Senate is going to do, so what is the use of putting it in this bill until the legislative bill passes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order conceded by the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained against the four named by the gentleman from Texas, the Business High School, Western High School, McKinley Manual Training High School, and Armstrong Manual Training High School. The rest of the language remains. Without objection the word "seven" will be changed to "three."

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for teachers, \$3,459,740.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington offers the following amendment: Page 36, at the end of line 17, insert: "Provided, That no part of this sum

shall be available for the payment of the salary of any teacher who teaches partisan politics, disrespect for the Holy Bible, or that ours is an inferior form of government."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs of same, pay of cabinetmaker, stationery, printing, ice, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including an allowance of not exceeding \$312 per annum for a motor vehicle for each of the superintendents of schools, the superintendent of janitors, the two assistant superintendents, the director of primary instruction, the school cabinetmaker, the supervising principal in charge of the white special schools, the chief medical and sanitary inspector of schools, and the supervising principal of the colored special schools, and including not exceeding \$3,000 for books of reference and periodicals, \$78,040: *Provided*, That a bond shall not be required on account of military supplies or equipment issued by the War Department for military instruction and practice by the students of high schools in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso for the purpose of asking a question. Has it been customary heretofore to have a bond?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The law requires that they shall put up a bond.

Mr. BEGG. Then, what is the reason for providing that they shall not put up a bond?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It would take \$600 to pay the premium on this bond, but we want to save that and it does not amount to anything at all.

Mr. BEGG. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completing the construction of a building to replace the present John F. Cook School, \$150,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was somewhat surprised when I learned that there has been no Budget estimate for the construction of new schools in the District of Columbia. From what has been told me by citizens who live here and who have children in these public schools there is, particularly in certain sections, a very crowded condition, and in a sense children are being denied proper school facilities. That is a condition which I do not think ought to exist in the National Capital.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It does not exist.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am going to cite the gentleman to a case where it does exist and I shall show facts which show that that condition exists.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It may exist in one or two places.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the point. If that is true, the Congress should provide relief for those one or two places, and that is the point I am making.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They have asked for no new school buildings at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not criticizing the gentlemen or the committee, but I am criticizing the commissioners and the Board of Education, if they are the ones who should submit such an estimate. I stated I was surprised there had been no estimate made for the construction of new schools, and it seems to me it is a neglect that ought to be called to the attention of those in authority here in the District. The Government pays 40 per cent of the expenditures of the District. Other cities do not have that contribution to their expenditures. Taxes are less in the District, as has been stated here many times, far less, than they are in any other city in the United States, where not only city taxes have to be paid but State and county taxes as well, and yet here in the National Capital we are confronted, as the gentleman says—in one or two sections, at least—with a situation that ought not to exist, because certainly the city of Washington ought to be a model for city governments throughout the United States, and certainly it ought not to be said that here in the National Capital we are denying the school children of this District proper school facilities. I want now to call your attention to a specific instance.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. May I interrupt the gentleman just a moment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say that the construction of the buildings in this bill and what they are about to put into effect in less than three or four months will provide for 9,888 elementary pupils more than we have now and 3,000 more high-school children, so that the chances are 10 to 1 that the places the gentleman is speaking about will be amply

taken care of in two or three months. One hundred and sixty-four additional rooms will be provided in this bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it will not relieve the situation in the locality to which I am going to refer now. Children ought not to be required to go from one end of this District to the other in order to get to school.

We know that the city of Washington in the last few years has grown as rapidly, if not more rapidly, than any other city in the Nation of its size, and I dare say there are few other cities where in the last three or four years they have not started the construction of additional school buildings.

This is a situation which has been called to my attention by a citizen of this community. He has no selfish interest, I want to say, because his youngest child is now in the high school, but as a citizen of the community he is interested in the children of the community and is interested in seeing proper school facilities provided. I want to read to you a statement which has been submitted to me which will show you that at least in this rapidly growing section in Cleveland Park the school facilities are being neglected, and those in authority, who ought to have submitted estimates, have neglected their duty in failing to come to Congress and submit estimates for the erection of at least one new school building in this particular locality.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield before reading that particular statement?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman think it is the business of the commissioners or the Board of Education or the Appropriations Committee to lay out a policy of new buildings, or does that belong to some committee of the House like the District Committee? I admit that what the gentleman is saying is absolutely true; in fact, I have made a statement along the same line; but who is at fault?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I said at the outset that I was not criticizing the committee of which I happen to be a member, because the Committee on Appropriations has always followed the policy, and must follow the policy, as the gentleman knows, of only acting on the estimates submitted. I am not criticizing particularly the District Committee.

Mr. BEGG. Whose business is it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am criticizing whoever it is in this District whose duty it is to come to Congress and tell Congress what is necessary in order to make proper provision for these children. I do not know whether it is the Board of Education or the commissioners, but somebody is certainly at fault.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure of that.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman knows that there is a whole list of new buildings in this bill, all of which could be knocked out on a point of order if anybody cared to make it, and if the Committee on Appropriations can not do this, what committee ought to take that responsibility?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The District Committee, of course, is the committee that should make the authorization.

Here is a case which I am going to call to your attention where I do not think legislation is necessary. All that is necessary is for somebody to come and tell the Committee on Appropriations what amount of money is necessary to begin the construction of a school there, and I think Congress would then have the authority to make the appropriation.

Mr. FREE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FREE. Is not it a fact that they have just completed a building in Cleveland Park and yet there are not facilities for the children to go to school. My two children are only permitted to go to school half a day because in that locality they have not buildings enough to take care of all of the children. My children have to stay away half a day or else go to some other part of the city.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct and in accord with the statement that I am going to read. That is the locality I had in mind, and the reason for my submitting these remarks. They talk about putting up buildings. Do you know that in the Woodley Park section, the vicinity of this school, in 1921 they made an appropriation of \$40,000 to buy a lot upon which to build a school building. That was three

years ago. The lot is there without having any building erected upon it. Some one in this District charged with the official duty of looking after the facilities for school children has failed to come here and tell us what is necessary to put a building on that lot. I say there is gross neglect in that particular locality of the needs of the school children of this District.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say in that connection that the same conditions as to the school children exist in the Western High School. There are so many pupils there that they have to have two shifts a day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think that is the situation in almost every school in the city, if the information that comes to me is correct. Now let me read this statement:

John Eaton School, at Thirty-fourth and Lowell Streets, serves the large and rapidly growing section including Cleveland Park, the English village, Massachusetts Heights Park, and the large apartment houses on and near Connecticut Avenue from the Million-Dollar and Calvert Street Bridges to the Klinge Valley Bridge near Cleveland Park. Included in this area are Wardman Park Hotel, Cathedral Mansions, and the large apartment houses at Connecticut and Cathedral Avenues; also the large Shapiro subdivision, one block east of Connecticut Avenue, between Connecticut Avenue and Woodley Place.

When the present John Eaton School was completed it was thought the school needs of this section had been met for some time. Four portables had been used before the building was finished. Upon its completion three of these were removed.

Now the school is filled to overflowing, and a general condition of congestion prevails. It has been found necessary in order to accommodate the pupils to take the following steps:

- Create a new first grade.
- Create a new fifth and sixth—a combination or doubling up.
- Create a new seventh and eighth—a combination or doubling up.
- Put the third grade into the portable.
- Put the new kindergarten in the teachers' room.
- Have the first and second grades go half time.

The scholastic increase at John Eaton year before last was 100. Last year it was 150.

John Eaton School serves the immense area from Chevy Chase to the Cook and Morgan Schools on Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets, respectively. Its present enrollment is 799, which is 121 more than the school, under school regulations, is intended to accommodate.

Around this little school there are now being finished or built, or being projected for immediate building, 730 homes and apartment houses containing 1,174 individual apartments. Real-estate operators estimate this will increase the population around John Eaton School by 7,600. Allowing one child of school age for each two adults, this will mean an addition in the near future of 3,750 school children. Nowhere in Washington in an area of like size are such extensive building operations under way, amounting to some \$28,000,000.

The present situation is critical. If another year is allowed to elapse without action being taken, a crisis will have been precipitated.

School population situation near John Eaton School as shown by building under way and projected

Builder	Homes or apartments built, building, or planned ¹	Value of improvement	Increase in population	Increase in school children
Wardman.....	Cathedral Mansions: 500 apartments nearing completion. English Village: 80 houses south of Klinge Road; 230 north of Woodley Road—built, building and planned—2-year project.	\$5,000,000	2,000	1,000
Joseph Shapiro.....	100 houses built and building—east of Connecticut Avenue, between Woodley Place and Cathedral Avenue.	7,000,000	1,500	700
	Apartment house to be built between Woodley Place and Woodley Road and Cathedral Avenue. 100 apartments, to be finished in year and a half.	1,500,000	500	250
		1,000,000	400	200
Kennedy Bros.....	60-room apartment just built; 44-room apartment just built; 70-room apartment building; projected: 1 of 50, 1 of 60, and 1 of 300 apartments; Connecticut and Cathedral Avenues.	5,000,000	2,000	1,000
Middaugh & Shannon.	300 homes Massachusetts Heights Park—built or projected for near future.	9,000,000	1,200	600
Total.....	1,904.....	28,500,000	7,600	3,750

¹ Does not include small or individual operations in this section.

And yet here we are making appropriations for the fiscal year 1925 and making no suitable provision for the increase of school children in that section of this city. In other words we are going another year without new buildings being contemplated, not due to the fault of Congress—and possibly some citizens may say that Congress is niggardly—but due to the fact that the officials of this city, those responsible for the city government, have failed to come to Congress and tell what they need and what is necessary to appropriate to give these children proper school facilities. Oh, they were quick to come to the Appropriations Committee and ask for \$200,000 to increase the park and buy somebody's property up in Klinge Valley for park purposes, but when it comes to the school children, giving them proper advantages of education, then they fail to take into account their necessities.

I have taken this time to call attention to the fact that somebody is failing to give attention to the needs of the District of Columbia for the school facilities which it ought to have. Certainly the citizens of Washington pay less taxes than the citizens of any other city in the United States and can afford proper facilities for school children. I know that all who take pride in this city are particularly anxious to see that the children are given the facilities that they ought to have.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Who is it in the gentleman's judgment that is at fault in not looking out for this matter?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course, the commissioners make the estimates for the Budget Bureau. Whether there is some one who must make these estimates for the commissioners I do not know. My opinion is that if I was a commissioner in this city and if I realized the conditions are as I have described I would see to it that those who had this duty imposed upon them in the first instance performed it; or as a commissioner I would take it on myself to come to Congress and see if I could not get what is needed.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words. Had the gentleman from Tennessee been here when I opened debate upon this appropriation bill and came to the matter of schools, about a week ago, he would have got my opinion—I do not say that he would have got any information, but he would have got an idea along the lines I was talking about. I then stated everything that the gentleman has now said. You will find it in the Record. I said that they wanted to buy large tracts of land when they already had four large tracts bought within the last two years, one costing \$215,000, two others at \$50,000 each, and another at \$40,000, upon which no estimates have ever been asked for buildings. I wound up my statement in conclusion by saying that it was time that some plan be devised, that they should get together and map out a regular plan and not go along haphazard, building here and buying a site there without any plan whatever. I said that I desired that to be done in order that the Appropriations Committee might proceed along proper lines.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order, that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas takes more time than anybody else in the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but we have some business to attend to besides here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has consumed more time to-day than 95 Members of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I guarantee that I have spent 25 hours on this more than the gentleman has, in my office and at night, with the gentleman somewhere else.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not true.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it is true.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am going to stop—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have mapped out in my speech the same program as the gentleman from Tennessee—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union,

reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8839, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. CONNERY, for one week, on account of important business.

Mr. MORGAN, indefinitely, on account of the death of his wife.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates to preside to-morrow, as Speaker pro tempore, at the memorial exercises for deceased New York Members, the gentleman from New York, Mr. PARKER.

INCREASE OF POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 10 days within which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 9035, the postal salary increase bill. I understand the majority report was to be filed to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for 10 days within which to file views of the minority on the bill H. R. 9035. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE M. E. BENTON

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the late M. E. Benton, a former member of the Committee on Appropriations, who died a few days ago at Springfield, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a notable ex-Missouri Congressman has passed away. On April 27 at Springfield, Mo., Col. M. E. Benton, died at the home of his son, Nat W. Benton. His home was at Neosho in southwest Missouri, and he had gone to Springfield to attend a democratic State convention assembled there to elect delegates to the national convention in New York City. M. E. Benton was born in Obion County, Tenn., in 1847 and was over 77 years of age when he died. He served in the Civil War on the Confederate side. In 1870 he graduated from the Cumberland University of Tennessee and shortly thereafter moved to Missouri, following the example of his illustrious great uncle and statesman, Thomas H. Benton, who likewise was a native of Tennessee and moved to Missouri and afterwards served 30 years in the United States Senate from his adopted State.

M. E. Benton was a former Member of Congress from the fifteenth district of Missouri, now represented with ability by our colleague, Hon. JOE J. MANLOVE. This district was formerly represented by Hon. Charles H. Morgan and Hon. William J. Stone, later Senator from Missouri. M. E. Benton entered the fifty-fifth Congress and served four successive terms with honor and distinction and for three terms was a member of the Appropriations Committee. He was an active Member during his entire service—eloquent of tongue and prominent in debate. Prior to his election to Congress he was United States district attorney for the western district of Missouri under Grover Cleveland, by whom he was appointed. A notable incident occurred while he was district attorney. For years he had never failed to take part in Democratic campaigns and his services were always in demand. While holding this Federal position he accepted an invitation and went out and made a Democratic speech in campaign year, and President Cleveland promptly removed him from office. It attracted the attention of the entire country. His party did not love him less because of his sacrifice. His friends did not fail him. Senators Vest and Cockrell and other friends rallied to his support and he was reinstated to office by Mr. Cleveland, who admonished him to forego making Democratic speeches in campaign times. Shortly after that he was elected to Congress. He was a courageous Democratic leader, bold in debate, and forceful in the discussion of public questions. He had taken active and prominent part in the political activities of his party for 50 years and never failed to attend and take part in the conventions of his party, over which he frequently presided, chosen because of his ability as a presiding officer and his parliamentary knowledge. He was learned in the law and enjoyed a large practice. He was a member of the constitutional convention of Missouri that recently framed and submitted many amendments to our constitution of 1875. He earned and deserved the high place to which he attained as a great Democrat, worthy of the honors that came to him because of his ability and unusual service.

He was my personal friend, and his notable record and service here makes it fitting that mention be made here of the passing into the great beyond of this strong and historic character.

TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed amendment to the labor provision of the transportation act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to have printed the telegram which I received to-day and which is as follows:

Waycross, Ga., May 2, 1924.

Congressman W. C. LANKFORD,

United States Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

The shopmen's association of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, representing 7,000 employees in the mechanical department, located at various points in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama, desire to file strenuous objections against the proposed legislation designed to change the labor provisions of the transportation act. Under the present law, we are free from dictation of the so-called standard labor organization and we have worked out a harmonious method for the handling of our own affairs with our employers in a manner that we believe will result in lasting benefit to ourselves, the traveling public, and the people of the communities where we reside and work. The satisfactory conditions now existing furnish full evidence that no change is necessary. We respectfully request that you oppose in our behalf the passage of the proposed law.

G. C. STEPHENS, President.

R. A. EVERETT, General Secretary-Treasurer.

To this telegram I replied as follows:

Washington, D. C., May 3, 1924.

Messrs. G. C. STEPHENS, President, and

R. A. EVERETT, General Secretary and Treasurer,

Waycross, Ga.:

Your message received. I have received many telegrams and letters from workmen, railroad owners, and citizens generally relative to the proposed change of the labor provisions of the transportation act, some advocating and some opposing it.

I am giving the matter most careful consideration, with an earnest desire to do what is best for all the people. It certainly is not my desire to do anything that will injure the workers of this country, and I would not vote for any measure which I thought would do this. I shall give your request most careful consideration; and thank you for wiring me.

W. C. LANKFORD.

Mr. Speaker, I shall indeed be very happy if we ever succeed here in Congress in working out a plan for the adjustment of the problems of labor and capital, which will be fair to both labor and capital and to the great mass of common people. Everyone is vitally interested in the proper solution of this very important problem.

I realize that capital is entitled to a fair return on its investment and that unless it receives such a return the railroads of our country and other such public utilities will cease to grow and help develop our Nation. I realize equally as well that labor is entitled to a fair return for keeping these great enterprises going and for its most splendid contribution to the welfare of the whole country. My sympathies are especially strong for railroad employees, my father having been a railroad employee for many years. He worked for several years as a track hand and later section foreman on what is now the Atlantic Coast Line, from Waycross to the Altamaha River, beyond Jesup, Ga. Although he quit the service of the railroad company before I was born I often heard him talk of his work as a railroad hand, and know that he always felt most kindly for others working for railroad companies and earning wages in any line of work. I always shared this feeling of my father. I might here add that I have every reason to be in deepest sympathy with the farmers of the country who are also vitally interested in this legislation. I was raised on the farm, and nearly all of my best friends in the world either live on the farm or were raised on the farm. So it is, Mr. Speaker, that when this bill comes up I shall approach it feeling in deep sympathy with all the parties concerned and most anxious to do what is best for all. There is no one thing which this Congress could do which would be of more vital importance to the whole Nation in the way of a law than a proper solution of the question presented by this proposed change of the labor provision of the transportation act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 1631. An act to authorize the deferring of payments of reclamation charges.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and, in accordance with the order heretofore made (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes, p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, May 4, 1924, at 3 o'clock, p. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 278. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3933, the Cape Cod Canal bill; without amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 279. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8209, the Inland Waterways Corporation bill; without amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRISP: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8905. A bill to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Hungary to the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAIGE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 9035. A bill reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FREDERICKS: Committee on Claims. S. 87. An act for the relief of the Near East Relief (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FREDERICKS: Committee on Claims. S. 555. An act for the relief of Blattmann & Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 799. An act for the relief of F. A. Maron; with an amendment (Rept. No. 640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK of New York: Committee on Claims. S. 935. An act for the relief of the Erie Railroad Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STEPHENS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1717. A bill authorizing the payment of six months' pay to Joseph J. Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1830. A bill for the refund of income tax erroneously collected; with an amendment (Rept. No. 643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of the Standard Oil Co. at Savannah, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FREDERICKS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2989. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Guess; with an amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4290. A bill for the relief of W. F. Payne; with amendments (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STEPHENS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5819. A bill for the relief of Capt. D. H. Tribou, chaplain, United States Navy; with amendments (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6506. A bill for the relief of John Baumen; without amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8297. A bill for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8893. A bill for the relief of Juana F. Gamboa; without amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5774. A bill for the relief of Beatrice J. Kettlewell; without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7194. A bill for the relief of Bertram Gardner, collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York; with amendments (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 909. A bill to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Frank George Bagshaw; with an amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ANDREW: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2105. A bill for the relief of Milton M. Fenner; without amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 9054) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the city of Port Huron, Mich., a portion of the Fort Gratiot Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 9055) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9056) to include as part of the national forests in Oregon certain lands within the exterior boundaries of such forests, which were a part of the former Oregon and California land grant; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9057) amending section 27 of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, relating to enlistments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9058) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Gatesville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9059) to provide for the purchase of a site for a post-office building at Mart, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9060) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Hamilton, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa (by request): A bill (H. R. 9061) to amend an act entitled "An act to license customhouse brokers," approved June 10, 1910, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 9062) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any and all claims, of whatever nature, which the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians may have or claim to have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS: A bill (H. R. 9063) to add certain lands to the Nevada National Forest, in Nevada; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9064) to provide for the protection of the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAGON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) authorizing and permitting the State of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and use permanent buildings, rifle ranges, and utilities at Camp Pike, Ark., as are necessary for the use and benefit of the National Guard of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 280) for the immediate consideration of House bill 5195, to provide for a bureau of prohibition in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 281) for the consideration of House bill 5722, authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Resolution (H. Res. 282) to make in order House bill 8202, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 9065) for the relief of Joseph F. Daniels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 9066) for the relief of William J. Nagel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 9067) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Compton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9068) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barnack; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9069) to credit the accounts of James Hawkins, special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 9070) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. R. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 9071) granting a pension to William C. Younce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9072) for the relief of Morgan L. Atchley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 9073) for the relief of John A. West; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9074) for the relief of Garrett Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2656. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Emerson-Brantingham Co., Rockford Paper Box Board Co., Rockford Manufacturers & Shippers' Association, Rockford Wholesale Grocery Co., Burson Knitting Co., Hess & Hopkins Leather Co., Barber-Colman Co., and J. Holmquist & Sons, all of Rockford, Ill., protesting against any change in the present transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2657. Also, petition of the American Federation of Railroad Workers, protesting against the passage of the Howell-Barkley bill (H. R. 7358); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2658. Also, petition of the Cox Jewelry Co. and C. A. Jensen, of La Salle; Lining Bros., of Peru; and W. T. Tress, Fred S. Keeler & Co., Fred H. Sanders, and Birger Carsen, of Ottawa, all in the State of Illinois, protesting against the tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2659. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Massachusetts Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Boston, Mass., petitioning that authorization be granted for the complete restoration and repairing of the frigate *Constitution* at the Charlestown Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2660. Also, petition of general executive board, International Association of Machinists, recommending favorable consideration of the Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2661. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California Independent Telephone Association, Pomona, Calif., in re elimination of tax on telephone and telegrams; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2662. Also, petition of National Paper Box Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against passage of House bill 762, providing for amendment of the pure food and drugs act of June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2663. Also, petitions of T. W. Simpson, Kennett, Calif., urging support of the Howell-Brinkley bill in re abolishment of Railway Labor Board, and American Federation of Railroad Workers, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against passage of Howell-Barkley bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2664. Also, petition of Penobscot Farm Center, Cool, Calif., opposing passage of the Paige-Kelly-Edge bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2665. Also, petition of Arhold Spring, Pasadena, Calif., urging passage of Senate bill 966, the San Carlos Dam project for the relief of the Pima Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

2666. Also, petitions of Seth Mann, of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, California, resolutions adopted in opposition to passage of Gooding bill (S. 2327), and the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, New York City, resolutions against anything that would restrict the Interstate Commerce Commission in re rate making; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2667. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, State of California, resolution urging passage of the Reece-Capper bill providing for distribution of surplus military material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2668. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Eldon, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2702 and Senate bill 742; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2669. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Aneta Commercial Club, Aneta, N. Dak., indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUNDAY, May 4, 1924

The House met at 3 o'clock p. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Hon. JAMES S. PARKER, of New York.

Rev. M. J. Riordan, pastor of St. Martin's Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord. Lord, hear my voice; let Thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplication. If Thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared. I wait for the Lord, my soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning. Let Israel hope in the Lord, for with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption.

Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday may be deferred until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings may be deferred until to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR Hon. W. BOURKE COCKRAN, Hon. DANIEL J. RIORDAN, Hon. LUTHER W. MOTT, AND Hon. JAMES V. GANLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the special order for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. CAREW, by unanimous consent—

Ordered, That Sunday, May 4, 1924, at 3 o'clock p. m., be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. W. BOURKE COCKRAN, Hon. DANIEL J. RIORDAN, Hon. LUTHER W. MOTT, and Hon. JAMES V. GANLY, late Representatives from the State of New York.

Mr. CAREW. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 283

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. W. BOURKE COCKRAN, Hon. DANIEL J. RIORDAN, Hon. LUTHER W. MOTT, and Hon. JAMES V. GANLY, late Members of the House from the State of New York.

Resolved, That Members be granted leave to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public services of the late Representatives.

Resolved, That, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of their distinguished public careers, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send copies of these resolutions to the families of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, we meet here this afternoon to pay tribute to the memory of four men who gave distinguished services to their country in this body—W. BOURKE COCKRAN, DANIEL J. RIORDAN, LUTHER W. MOTT, and JAMES V. GANLY. I came here this afternoon, not to mourn the death of any of these men, but to call attention to the reasons why we should be happy that they lived and rendered such distinguished services to their country. I came here especially to speak of the work and life and character of my very warm personal friend and fellow associate here for 20 years, DANIEL J. RIORDAN. He was one of the most kindly spirits I ever knew. There was no day too long and no work too hard for him to do. There was no task too difficult for him to undertake for the people of the State from which he came and in which he lived.

He was a very modest, unassuming man, simple in his daily life. He had ability that few men realized. He was one of the most eloquent, interesting, and humorous men when he chose to exercise the gift of oratory. He seldom chose to exercise it. He believed that much better results for the country could be obtained by doing the real work for which he was sent here than by occupying the time of the House in delivering speeches. He was one of the most influential men who ever served on the Committee on Naval Affairs. He